

Concordia Theological Monthly

Vol. VII

NOVEMBER, 1936

No. 11

Walther, a Christian Theologian.

II.

Dr. Walther gave undying allegiance to the *sola Scriptura*. The doctrine of the authority and inspiration of Scripture lay close to his heart. But there was another matter which lay — yes, we may put it thus — still closer. The one thing which he stressed above all things, which he had in view in all his theological work, and in the interest of which he fought so staunchly and persistently for the *sola Scriptura*, was the Gospel of the grace of God in Christ. He fought for the verbal inspiration not merely in order to fulfil a duty laid upon the Christian theologian by Scripture. No; Scripture was so sacred to him because it bears the Gospel of salvation. Scripture took him captive by this, that the Gospel of grace took him captive. Dr. Walther was a Gospel theologian. His chief interest lay in bringing the Gospel of grace to the sinner and in training men for this one great work of the Christian Church.

Dr. Walther was a Christian theologian. The theology of the Christian Church is the theology of grace. The Christian people live on the Gospel of grace. Those who base their hope of salvation on their own work and worth, and those who teach and encourage them to do so, "are either Jews, or Mohammedans, or papists, or heretics; for there is no mean between these two righteousnesses, the working righteousness of the Law and the suffering righteousness of Christ. Whoever therefore strays away from the Christian righteousness must fall back into the working righteousness; that is, he has lost Christ and must have recourse to his own works and put his trust in them. . . . They are not Christians, but are and remain work-saints, whatever other name they may bear, Jews, Mohammedans, papists, or Anabaptists, etc." (Luther, IX, 24 f.) The ministry which the Christian theologian has received of the Lord Jesus consists in testifying the Gospel of the grace of God, Acts 20, 24. And that was the ministry of Dr. Walther: faithfully and powerfully he testified the Gospel of the grace of God.

He preached the Gospel of grace in its fulness. He presented to the sinful world and the Christian people all the elements of saving grace—saving grace in that it is for all, saving grace in that it does all. He presented the doctrine of *universal grace* in its full import. "We know that God really and truly would have all men to be saved. He has revealed that to us in His Word. And we can never sufficiently praise God for this, that He is such a tender Father, that He would have mercy even on the most depraved of men." (*Proc. West. Dist.*, 1874, p. 31.) For this he loved the Gospel: "Since all men are reconciled to God and the Gospel is the message thereof, it is such an ineffable grace to come within the sound of the Gospel" (see *Lehre u. Wehre*, 1890, p. 46), and denounced the denial of it as a crime against God and humanity: "Nowadays all Lutheran people know that according to the Holy Scriptures the saving grace of the Father is universal; so is the redemption of the Son and likewise the effective calling of the Holy Spirit through the Word, while the teaching of the Reformed Church on these three points is particularistic; for the Reformed most emphatically contend that God has created the greater part of the human race unto eternal damnation and has accordingly assigned them even in eternity to everlasting death. In the clear light of the precious, saving Gospel this is an appalling, a horrible doctrine." (*The Proper Distinction between Law and Gospel*, p. 126.) It is a horrible doctrine, for it robs God of His honor and deprives the sinner of the needed comfort. "What rich comfort flows from this doctrine that God is Love and would have all men to be saved, to enjoy His love in all eternity! Serious misgivings so often oppress the heart. It deeply feels the wrath of God. It asks, Does God's love extend to me, too? Am I, too, miserable creature that I am, redeemed? In such afflictions we must show that these thoughts dishonor God, who is the eternal Love. But when we overcome these doubts in this way that we constantly keep before our eyes the universal gracious will of God and cling to that in faith, we give God all honor. . . . Satan's chief object is to keep us from trusting in the love of God and thus becoming divinely assured of our salvation. So we see of what inestimable importance and how precious and salutary the doctrine of the universality of God's grace is." (*Proc. West. Dist.*, 1874, p. 38.) Faithfully Walther guarded this priceless treasure. He warded off the Calvinistic speculations on the "sovereignty" of God. He did not yield to the argument of carnal reason that, if it is due to God's gracious will alone that I am saved, it must also be due to God's will that another is not saved. Walther took his stand *on Scripture* and thus was enabled to acquit himself as a Christian theologian, a faithful witness of the grace of God, to proclaim the glorious message: "'The grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared to *all men*.' Oh, the height and depth, the

breadth and length, of it! Oh, the inexhaustible riches of grace! Rejoice, O my soul; not one, of all that belong to the human race not one is excluded, for the saving grace of God hath appeared 'to all men'; it brings salvation to all, to all of them; God would save all, all of them, despite their sin and unworthiness, freely and without cost, as grace is wont to deal. . . . As the vault of heaven encloses the whole terrestrial ball, every portion and point of it, so the heaven of God's grace encloses the whole world of sinners that inhabits this earth. A man can so harden himself that *he* does not care for grace; but he cannot sin so grievously that grace does not care for *him*." (*Brosamen*, p. 24 f.) ¹⁾

Just as clearly and forcefully he proclaimed the *sola gratia*. *We owe our salvation to grace alone*. First, we obtain the forgiveness of sins as a free gift. God does not offer to justify the sinner on condition that he do something to make himself worthy of the forgiveness of sins. God is not waiting for us to reconcile Him to us. Christ has fully taken care of that. God is reconciled, the sins of the world are already forgiven, a free pardon is offered to all. The Jew, says Walther, offers to buy his pardon by observing the Law of Moses; the Mohammedan, by living according to the Koran; the papist, with his contrition and satisfactions; "the Lutheran Church, however, tells the sinner, as the Word of God tells him: *Es ist schon alles getan*; you are already redeemed, you are already justified before God; you need not therefore do anything to redeem yourself, to reconcile God to you, to earn your salvation. All that has already been accomplished. Only believe! Believe that Christ, the Son of God, has already gained all this for you; through this faith you obtain all this and are saved." (*Proc. West. Dist.*, 1874, p. 43.) Forgiveness of sins as a free gift, gained by Christ on the cross once for all (objective justification) and accepted by the sinner by faith (subjective justification) — that is the Gospel in which Walther gloried; for that is the only message that can bring joy to the sinner's heart. "Since all men are reconciled to God and the Gospel is the message thereof, it is such an ineffable grace to come within the sound of the Gospel." "God is reconciled. Accordingly, the Apostle Paul calls on us: 'Be ye reconciled to God.' That means: Since God has been reconciled to you by Jesus Christ, grasp the hand which the Father in heaven holds out to you. . . . Righteousness lies ready; it must not first be achieved by man. If man were to attempt to do so, that would be an awful crime, a fighting against grace and against the reconciliation and perfect redemption accomplished by the Son of God. . . . Having this doctrine, what exceedingly happy and blessed people we Lutherans

1) In the days of Walther men were telling one another, and some believe it to this day, that Walther was a Calvinist in disguise. It is one of the saddest chapters in church history.

are! This teaching takes us to Christ by a straight route. It opens heaven to us when we feel hell in our hearts. It enables us to obtain grace at any moment, without losing time by following a wrong way, striving for grace by our own effort, as we sometimes do with a good intention. We can approach Christ directly and say: 'Lord Jesus, I am a poor sinner; I know it; that has been my experience in the past, and when I reflect what is going on in my heart now, I must say, that is still my experience. But Thou hast called me by Thy Gospel. I come to Thee just as I am; for I could come no other way.' That is the saving doctrine which the Evangelical Lutheran Church has learned from Christ and the apostles." (*The Proper Distinction*, etc., p. 136 f.)

We owe our salvation entirely to God's grace; for, in the second place, this faith by which we accept the forgiveness of sins as a free gift is itself God's work, God's gift. Grace carries through the work of salvation; grace accomplishes it from beginning to end; at no stage is the sinner called upon to contribute something of his own. Conversion is solely and exclusively the work of God. "God the Holy Spirit effects the sinner's conversion because of grace, for Christ's sake; man can hinder his conversion, but cannot cooperate towards it." (*Proc. North. Dist.*, 1873, p. 43.) And what moved God to create faith in my heart? Was there anything in me to attract God's favorable attention? Did He see some spiritual change and improvement in me on the basis of which He could successfully carry on His work or for the sake of which He would bother with me? No, says Walther; He converted me "because of his grace, for Christ's sake." "Who among us, if he is a true Christian, will not declare: I would never have sought the dear Lord if He had not sought me; I would never have believed on the Lord Jesus Christ if the Holy Ghost had not granted me this great gift of faith; I have not earned it through my conduct, through my prayers, through my struggling and striving! . . . Every one who is really converted will speak thus, and one who thinks he has acquitted himself so well in this matter, he has been so willing, he has helped along, and his many labors, many tears, many prayers, counted for something, he is a miserable hypocrite, who is blinded by the devil. Man can do nothing, nothing; God must do all. . . . That is the Scriptural teaching, that is also the Lutheran teaching, and it gives all honor to God, though it is an abomination and offense to all Pharisees." (*Proc. West. Dist.*, 1876, p. 65.) "*Wir wollen dem Menschen keinen Anteil geben an seiner Seligmachung. . . . Das ist unser Interesse.*" (*Proc. Sec. Gen. Pastoral Conf.*, Fort Wayne, 1881, p. 25.) For to have man cooperate towards his conversion or produce the necessary conditions for his conversion would be demanding the impossible of him; for he is spiritually dead, and it would cast him into despair; or it would make of him a self-satisfied Pharisee.

Tenaciously Walther clung to the article that man can do nothing, that God does all in converting, saving, the sinner. He, too, was tempted by his flesh to embrace the Pelagian creed, that man can effect his own conversion, or the Semi-Pelagian creed, that man can claim half the credit, or the synergistic creed, that man can at least make the beginning and give God a chance. He trampled the satanic delusion under foot. Nor would he yield to the arguments of his *rationalistic* flesh. The synergists told him—and his synergistic reason told him—that, if salvation depends entirely on God, God must also be made responsible for the perdition of men; that, since God's grace is universal, the reason why some are saved and not others must lie in man, the reason being that the saved were made of better stuff than the others; that, therefore, in order to save the *gratia universalis*, the *sola gratia* must be qualified, restricted, reduced; if you do not so qualify it, if you exclude man's part in his conversion, you lay yourself open to the charge of Calvinism. Walther trampled the temptation under foot. He was a Bible theologian and said: "Our reason will at once raise the objection: If that is so, if man cannot do the least thing towards his conversion, it must be God's fault that so many are not converted; if God does all, if He must take away our resistance; if the cause of man's non-resisting, of his conversion, does not lie at all in him, God must be the cause why so many are not converted. Thus reason argues; and, in truth, we have here an absolutely incomprehensible mystery. But let it be ever so incomprehensible, ever so contradictory, that does not bother us Lutherans." (*Proc. West. Dist.*, 1876, p. 63.) It does seem that you cannot retain *universal* grace if you maintain *sole* grace. But what does a Christian do in such a case? You have read Walther's article in *Lehre u. Wehre*, 1880, p. 257 ff.: "*Was soll ein Christ tun, wenn er findet, dass zwei Lehren, die sich zu widersprechen scheinen, beiderseits klar und deutlich in der Schrift gelehrt werden?*" Walther had learned the great art of the Christian theologian to set Scripture above reason, and so he had learned the greatest of all arts: to comfort men with the *gratia universalis* and to glory in the *sola gratia*. And how he gloried in it to the glory of God! "When we enter heaven, we shall have no reason to take credit unto ourselves. We shall not say: Well, I am now in glory, but I certainly did all that was in my power to achieve that! No, this cursed self-praise will never be heard in heaven. All the elect and all angels of heaven know nothing but to praise God's grace. It is all, altogether, grace—that, dear brethren, must be the guiding star of our present discussion. We must shudder at the possibility of tolerating any teaching here which robs God of the glory that it is all, all, pure grace and nothing else. I do not hope to be saved because I imagine that I am better by a hair's breadth than the vilest sinner,

but because God has revealed in His Word that it was the good pleasure of His will to make of me, a poor, lost sinner, an everlasting monument of his eternal grace." (*Proc. West. Dist.*, 1877, p. 26.)

Walther, the faithful witness of the Gospel of grace, gave himself up to it entirely. The article of saving grace reigned in his heart. First, it ruled and shaped his theology. He understood and stressed its supreme importance. The only hope of the sinner lies in the article of the grace of God in Christ. Deny this article, and you destroy the comfort of the Christian; violate it in any way, and his comfort is shaken. The insistence on the absolute need of the full grace of God in Christ for salvation is the characteristic of Walther's theology as it is the characteristic of the theology of the Bible. Hear him speak, for instance, of this one phase of saving grace, of the *sola gratia*. The teaching that a man's salvation depends on his self-determination "subverts the whole Christian religion, denies Christ as the sole foundation of our salvation and the only Savior of mankind, repudiates thus the Gospel, disavows the power of the blood and death of Christ and His redemption, takes from God the glory that He alone saves us, and gives this glory partly to man; yea, since salvation and the mercy of God are made to depend 'at bottom and so solely and entirely' on the conduct of man, on his free personal self-determination, it is given to man *entirely*." (*Lehre u. Wehre*, 1872, page 322.)

Furthermore, the importance of the article of saving grace lies in its relation to all the other doctrines of Scripture. It gives them their importance. They would be meaningless without the article of salvation by grace. When, therefore, this article is denied or vitiated, all other articles must be given a new, an unscriptural, meaning. And where this article is honestly held, it will ultimately rectify the error that has crept in elsewhere. "For the devil at all times assaults the grace of God; no heresy can bear the teaching of divine grace." (Luther, 3, p. 163.) . . . Every heresy that has sprung up was caused by the heretics' inability to believe that man becomes righteous in the sight of God and is saved by grace alone. That is the real rock of offense against which all heresies, all false teachers, dash their head." (*The Proper Distinction*, etc., pp. 160. 163.) "On the other hand," says Luther (VIII, 628), as quoted by Walther, "this power inheres in this article, that, if you give yourself to it whole-heartedly and earnestly, it will not let you stray into heresy and fight against Christ and Christendom." (*Die luth. Lehre v. d. Rechtf.*, p. 11.) "This made Luther the invincible Reformer. If he had not stood on this rock, a man like Erasmus could have thrown him easily. But standing on this rock, — 'in my heart there reigns, and shall ever reign, this one article, namely, faith in my dear Lord Christ, which is the sole beginning, middle, and end of all spiritual

and godly thoughts which I may have at any time, day or night' (IV, 8), — he laughed at the Pope's doctors, and at Zwingli, too. As often as new deceiving spirits confronted him, he tested them with this article, and if they did not agree with it, he said: Depart — to him who sent you." (*Proc. Syn. Conf.*, 1872, p. 27.) Walther understood the interrelation of the articles of the Christian religion. He put the doctrine of saving grace into the center.

There is the article of justification by faith, the chief article of the Christian religion, and at the center of this article lies the *sola gratia* — "being justified freely by His grace." Since the grace of God culminates in the justification of the sinner, the greatest blessing and the source of all blessings, the article of justification is the chief article, the heart of the Christian religion; but since justification is by grace alone, you can say just as well that salvation by grace is the chief article, the heart of the Christian religion. Says Walther: "The Evangelical Lutheran Church assigns to every doctrine of Scripture the position and importance which Scripture gives it. A. The fundamental and chief doctrine, from which all other doctrines derive their importance, is the doctrine of Christ, or of justification." (*Die Ev.-Luth. Kirche die wahre sichtbare Kirche*, Thesis 18, p. 108.)

There is the article of the distinction between the Law and the Gospel. That is nothing else than the article of salvation by grace alone, applied to the need of the terrified sinner. Walther indicates the close relation of these two doctrines when he points out that the Lutheran Church, understanding the relative importance of the various Bible doctrines, places first (A.) the doctrine of Christ, or of justification, but then urges at once the supreme necessity of distinguishing between the Law and the Gospel. "B. The Evangelical Lutheran Church distinguishes sharply between the Law and the Gospel." (*Die Ev.-Luth. Kirche*, etc., p. 111.) Both doctrines are of the same importance, — "This distinction between Law and Gospel is the highest art in Christianity, which all who boast or accept the Christian name can or should know. For where there is a defect on this point, a Christian cannot be distinguished from a heathen or a Jew, for it is just here that the difference lies" (Luther, IX, 798, quoted by Walther, *op. cit.*, p. 112), — for both treat of the same matter; the Christian has learned this highest art and declares: "According to the *Law*, which charges me with my guilt, I am indeed a lost, condemned sinner; but *I appeal from the Law to the Gospel*, for God has given, besides the Law, another word, that is, the Gospel, which gives us this grace, the forgiveness of sins, eternal righteousness and life, frees me from my terror and damnation, and assures me that all guilt is paid by the Son of God, Jesus Christ Himself." (*Op. cit.*, p. 113.) And, besides, this highest of all arts is not the

Christian's own achievement, but, again, God's gracious gift. Says Luther, says Walther: "Without the Holy Ghost it is impossible to grasp and make this distinction." What place do the means of grace occupy in the divine scheme of salvation? They derive their importance from their relation to the article of saving grace: they are the means which bring to us the grace gained by Christ, confer upon us the forgiveness of sins. And it is of vital importance that the sinner make such use of them. "The Lutheran Church teaches, not only that we are saved by grace alone, that this grace has been gained for us by Christ, the Son of God and Redeemer of the world, that we lay hold of this grace by faith alone, but she teaches also that the good God has instituted certain means into which He has placed this grace and through which He places it into our hands; and those means are the Word of God, Baptism, and the Lord's Supper. They contain the grace which was in God's heart from eternity towards us poor sinners, which Christ gained for us; they are the hands by which God bestows it upon us, so that He is all in all and we have nothing to glory in." (*Proc. West. Dist.*, 1876, p. 21.) "It is a useless tale when I am told about a precious treasure which I am to fetch if the way to the treasure is not shown me and the means for lifting it. Such talk will seem sheer twaddle. But that is exactly the fanatics' way of talking about the great treasure that lies concealed in the Christian religion. When they are asked about the way to get it, they cannot tell it. . . . Whoever does not go to these places (Word, Baptism, Lord's Supper) to lift it will not fetch any gold. What he gets may look like gold, but it is mere tinsel. Would that I could press this truth deeply into your hearts and that the sound of my words would not simply sweep past your ears, but bring energy and life to you! Oh, what witnesses you would become by refusing to deny the grace of God in Christ as the fanatics do!" (*The Proper Distinction*, etc., p. 163.)

What is faith, and why does faith justify, faith alone? Unless you teach that grace alone saves, you will harbor and spread Jewish and Gentile opinions concerning faith. Why can faith save? "When Christ says: 'He that believeth . . . shall be saved,' He is telling us: You have fallen away from God through sin, fallen into an eternal debt, which you cannot pay. But be comforted; I, the Son of God, have paid your debt and thereby regained for you the grace of God and eternal salvation, and I offer you all this as a free gift. Now, then, accept this gift, and all will be well. And it is just this acceptance which constitutes the faith of which the Christian religion speaks." (*Lutherstunde*. See *Lehre u. Wehre*, 1890, p. 183.)

And this faith by which the sinner obtains the treasures of God's grace is itself a gift of pure grace. Conversion is in no wise the achievement of man, but altogether and in every respect God's work

in us. Take the *sola gratia* out of the article of conversion, and you will be teaching nothing but Jewish, Gentile opinions on conversion. Was Walther a Christian theologian? You have read above what he had to say on this matter. He was raised up by God to keep the *sola gratia* in the article of conversion. For that he lived and labored. That was the crowning glory of his work.

Walther preached powerfully on sanctification. Powerfully—because he knew, and led men to, the only source from which personal holiness and all spiritual life and power flow. “The grace of God, . . . teaching us that, denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world.’ As soon as a man really comes under the grace of God in Christ, this grace takes him in hand and like a faithful mother nurturing her child trains and rears him in the hatred of all ungodliness and worldly lusts. . . . Such a one guards his body as a temple of the Holy Ghost lest it be defiled by sin and watches over his soul as belonging to Jesus Christ, bought with a great price, that it may remain His. He is impelled to do for his neighbor what God did for him, lovingly, gently, humbly; and he finds the happiness of his life in this, that it is spent in the service of God. Finally the grace of God teaches and trains us to look for the glorious appearing of the Savior Jesus Christ. When a man once knows what God’s grace in Christ means, his whole nature and life are changed. Without grace a man clings to this life, the life on earth. Under grace, he looks forward to the appearing of Christ, at death or at the Last Day, waiting for it with the eager expectancy of our children at the approach of Christmas Eve.” (*Brosamen*, p. 26 f.) Where the grace of God is preached, “people will furthermore notice that wonderful things are happening among them. Alas! many ministers do not meet with these wonderful experiences; their hearers remain sleepy; their misers stay stingy. What is the reason? Not sufficient Gospel has been preached to them.” (*The Proper Distinction*, etc., p. 406.)

The uncompromising stand which Walther took in the long controversy on the Church and the Ministry was due not only to his zeal for purity of doctrine in general, but also and chiefly (and at bottom it amounts to the same thing) to his passion for keeping the article of saving grace inviolate. He points out, for instance: “When men make salvation dependent on the communion with any visible Church, they subvert the article of the justification of a poor sinner before God by faith *alone*.” (*Die Stimme unserer Kirche*, etc., under Thesis IX.) “Clearly the teaching that there is a visible Church outside of which there is no salvation and that the validity of absolution depends on the ordination of the administrant, etc., is in conflict with the truth that faith alone saves.” (*Die lutherische Lehre v. d. Rechtf.*, p. 93.) “As soon as you add the qualification ‘alone-saving’

to the Lutheran Church, you detract from the doctrine of justification by grace through faith in Jesus Christ and confound Law and Gospel." (*The Proper Distinction*, etc., p. 343; cp. pp. 345, 337, 339.) The false teaching on Church and Ministry is not a small matter. When Walther and his brethren had fought their way through to a clear understanding of this doctrine, he declared: "There is no doubt in our mind that, if God in His infinite mercy had not come to our aid, making us to see the Romanizing features of our former doctrine and practise, we should not only have been working towards the destruction of Christianity, but also ourselves should have been lost eternally." (*Lutheraner*, 1857, p. 2; cp. *Lutheraner*, 1845, p. 79.) Note also *this* angle: When the ministry sets itself above the common Christians, it makes light of the surpassing dignity and glory which saving grace, justifying grace, has conferred upon these common Christians. "The minister administers his office and absolves 'in the name and behalf of the congregation.' Our moderns are horrified at hearing this. Administer our office in the name and by authority of peasants and tradespeople! We are royal-Prussian and royal-Bavarian pastors—that is our glorious office! In their blindness they find their glory in their shame, and are unable to realize what a great honor it is to administer the office in the name of the Christians. There are no people on earth more distinguished than they; the angels serve them; above them is the open heaven; God has come down to them; they are clothed with the priestly robe of Christ's righteousness." (*Lehre u. Wehre*, 1876, p. 66.) The following, too, is worthy of note. Replying in 1843 to Grabau's *Hirtenbrief*, G. H. Loeber, Walther and their associates stress this point among others: "Let us, dear colleague, devote our attention above all things to this, *thoroughly to search out and to preach in its fulness the pure Gospel of the free grace of God*, and let us trust God that *through this Word* He will mightily protect His Church in these last perilous times against all the gates of hell. If His Spirit and power were not with the Word, we ourselves could not accomplish anything, not even with our preaching of the pure Word, much less through the weight of our office or the scaffolding of order and ordinances." (See Hochstetter, *Geschichte der Missourisynode*, p. 193.) Nothing, nothing, must take the place of, or interfere with, the preaching of saving grace.²⁾

2) Dr. H. E. F. Guericke, siding with Walther, uttered his warning in these words: "The papistical mischief begins inconspicuously and innocently by exalting indifferent ceremonies, then little by little puts the 'succession of the means of grace,' by which alone the Church is built, into the background, stressing the 'succession of the ministers,' proceeds, consistently, to make 'order' and organization, not doctrine, the all-important thing, in consequence of which *the Gospel is made light of* and human ordinances and institutions are made much of, and finally reaches the papistical

Need we ask how the doctrine of election is related to the article of saving grace? Its very name tells us that — *election of grace*. *Sola gratia* is the heart of the article of election. We owe our conversion to the grace of God alone, 2 Tim. 1, 9, and this grace was bestowed upon us in eternity, in God's gracious election, 2 Tim. 1, 9. When Walther treated the doctrine of the eternal election, all his thoughts revolved about this one thing, the *sola gratia*. He made the statement, quoted above: "*Wir wollen dem Menschen keinen Anteil geben an seiner Seligmachung. Das ist unser Interesse*," while he was discussing the doctrine of election. Election was his theme when he uttered the words quoted above: "When we enter heaven, we shall have no reason to take credit unto ourselves. . . . It is all, altogether, grace." We owe our election to the *sola gratia*. . . . Thesis 10 of the Thirteen Theses: "We believe, teach, and confess that the cause which moved God to choose the elect is solely His grace and the merit of Jesus Christ and not any good thing which God has foreseen in the elect, even not the faith foreseen by God in them." And we owe our salvation to "His own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began." — Thesis 11: "We believe, teach, and confess that election is not the mere foresight or foreknowledge of the salvation of the elect, but also a cause of their salvation and what pertains thereto."

The rule applies to every other doctrine: Unless you know its relation to the doctrine of saving grace, you will distort or misapply it. Take the doctrine of eternal damnation — "The Lord never makes mention of hell except for the purpose of bringing men to heaven." (*The Proper Distinction*, etc., p. 404.) In the Christian theology all articles converge upon, or radiate from, the grace of God in Christ. "The grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared to all men" — that ruled and shaped Walther's theology.

form of the Middle Ages, which claims all divine and human rights and presses them into its service." (See Hochstetter, *Geschichte*, etc., p. 233.) — Walther's warning against slighting the Gospel was directed not only to those who placed the strength of the Church in the hierarchical "order." He condemned with the same vehemence every movement and tendency which would supplant the simple preaching of the Gospel with something more powerful. There are men who slur over the Gospel and stress "life and work," relying upon the activities of the Church, the legitimate and necessary activities, to put new life into the Church. Dr. Walther taught us that our first concern must be the study and the preaching of the Gospel of grace. That, and that alone, preserves and builds the Church. Nothing must interfere with, or take the place of, the Gospel. "Through the Word alone the mighty deeds which fill the history of the Church have been performed. Through the Word alone the Church will be preserved in these last evil days unto the end of the world." (*Brosamen*, p. 527.) Where the Gospel is preached abundantly, "people notice that wonderful things are happening among them." (*The Proper Distinction*, etc., p. 406.) Preach "the pure Gospel of the free grace of God in its fulness. Through this Word, God will protect His Church against all the gates of hell."

Next, and necessarily so, it *ruled and shaped his policy*. As a Christian preacher he knew nothing but Christ crucified and knew that he could achieve the purpose of his ministry — the salvation of souls — in no other way than by preaching the Gospel of grace of God in Christ. And his sole aim as a teacher of Christian theology was to enable and train men to pursue the same policy. At the dedication of Concordia Seminary in 1883 he said: "In this house young Christians shall be fitted to become heralds of the Gospel of Christ, the Son of God and Savior of the world, who will confess with the holy twelve apostles: 'We are determined not to know anything among you save Jesus Christ, and Him crucified. By grace are ye saved, through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God.'" (Hochstetter, *Geschichte*, etc., p. 451.) And he said: "Any other teaching can produce great Pharisees, but not Christians. One becomes a Christian only in this way, that he learns from the Holy Ghost that he is really redeemed, that he has forgiveness of sins, a reconciled heavenly Father, the righteousness that avails before God, and so can cheerfully await his dying hour." (*Proc. Syn. Conf.*, 1872, p. 25.) Do you want to reach men's hearts, win them for Christ? "In accordance with God's will it should be the preacher's aim to *proclaim the Gospel to his hearers till their hearts are melted*, till they give up their resistance and confess that the Lord has been too strong for them, and henceforth they wish to abide with Jesus." (*The Proper Distinction*, etc., p. 406.) Is the Church in need of a reformation? Is her spiritual life at a low ebb? What then is the remedy? There is only one. All other remedies may galvanize a Church into temporary activity. But this is what puts life into the Church: "The weakest graduate, if only he has grasped the doctrine that the grace of God in Christ Jesus has appeared to all men, to be received freely, by faith, can preach to men in such a way that they are assured of their salvation, and that is worth more than all the wisdom and all the possessions and treasures of the world. What is all erudition, as necessary as it is in its place, compared with the wisdom of God which is set forth when but the simple passage is expounded: 'God so loved the world,' etc.? Hearing this, all poor sinners rejoice, all the holy angels are filled with wonder, and the whole world should sink upon its knees and sing 'Gloria' and 'Hallelujah.' If our young preachers preach this, they are the men who can start a reformation in our country as indeed in this way a small beginning has already been made." (*Proc. Syn. Conf.*, 1872, p. 28.) What the world needs and what the Church needs is the preaching of the Gospel of the grace of God in Christ. And that means a preaching in which the gracious forgiveness of sins forms the burden of the message and is continually in the mind of the preacher. The Gospel-preacher treats all the doctrines of the Bible fully, exhaustively, but

he is always hastening towards his real subject, the gracious forgiveness of sins. He does not treat this article only occasionally, when he might feel that now its turn has come in the series of Christian teachings. No, it is always before him, he is always presenting it. He is obsessed with the fear that there might be too little Gospel in his preaching. He does not fear that people might say, as Luther puts it, "he is always harping on one string, he knows only one tune" (IV, 1741). No, says Luther, "a preacher of the right sort puts this article above everything else and preaches it continuously, this article, on which the true knowledge of God and our salvation hinges — this article that whoever has Christ has the Father and all grace, all divine blessings, and eternal life." (VIII, 798.) Says Walther: "The Word of God is not rightly divided when the person teaching it does not allow the Gospel to have a general predominance in his teaching." (Last thesis in *The Proper Distinction*, etc., p. 403.) That ministry is bound to be successful which makes the Gospel of grace the center of the preaching and of all church-work. There people "see wonderful things happening." And: "If you preach the Gospel abundantly, you need not fear that your people will leave your church when some spiritual mountebank comes along and starts an unseemly exhibition in his pulpit. Your people will say: Our minister has given us what we could not get anywhere else. He is a true Lutheran minister and pours out a great treasure for us every Sunday." (*Op. cit.*, p. 408.) Any other kind of ministry, the substitution of any other kind of work for the preaching of the Gospel of grace, will not satisfy your people — nor yourselves; it gets no lasting results. "If you had to preach nothing else than sterile ethics, you might consider that a tedious task, yielding meager results. But if you have experienced in your heart what it means to convey to poor, lost, and condemned sinners the consolation of the Gospel and say to them: 'Do but come and believe,' — I say, if you believe this and ponder the full meaning of this, you cannot but look forward with joy to the day when you will stand for the first time before your congregations to deliver this august message." (*Op. cit.*, p. 137 f.)

The article of saving grace was the one important thing to Walther. That ruled and shaped his policy throughout, for instance, also in his dealing with those who differed from him in doctrinal matters. Says Dr. Pieper: "Walther was disposed to recognize as orthodox not as few, but as many persons as possible. He is stern in passing judgment on people whom he beholds sacrificing *sola gratia*. But people who hold fast this central doctrine gain his cordial good will, and he is confident that this truth which they hold will lead them to put away their error." (*Conversion and Election*, p. 83.)

Finally, the article of saving grace shaped and ruled his life. We heard him say, above: "It is such an ineffable grace to come

within the sound of the Gospel." To it he owed the greatest happiness that can come to a human being. You know the story: "They [Walther's associates at the university] founded their hopes of salvation not so much on the grace of God and the merits of Christ as on a certain degree of contrition and repentance to which they must have attained. This brought Walther into deep distress; terrible conflicts of soul resulted. Doubts and uncertainty concerning his salvation brought him to the verge of despair. He says: 'Praying, sighing, weeping, fasting, struggling, was of no avail; the peace of God had departed from my soul.' He was rescued from this awful torment by a pastoral letter from Rev. M. Stephan, to whom he had written for advice. Stephan advised him to hasten to the saving arms of Jesus, and he would find healing under His wings. This Walther did, and the peace of God returned to his heart." (Pastor J. A. Friedrich, in *Ebenezer*, p. 24.) To the unmerited grace of God he ascribed his understanding of the article of saving grace in its full import. (See, for instance, *Lutheraner*, 1857, p. 2) Whatever success he and our Synod had in the work of the Church "was solely and entirely the work of God's great, free grace." (*Brosamen*, p. 564 f.) And the grace of God that brought him salvation and assured him of his eternal salvation was the breath of his life and his stay in trial and tribulation. "All my hopes have come to naught; this one hope, however, sustains me, that our Father in heaven will soon deliver me from every evil of body and soul, property and honor, and finally, when my last hour has come, grant me miserable sinner for my Lord Jesus' sake a blessed end and graciously take me from this vale of tears to Himself in heaven. 'Eia, waer'n wir da! Eia, waer'n wir da!'" (From a letter to a friend. M. Guenther, *Dr. C. F. W. Walther*, p. 230.)

Walther lived on the Gospel of grace, and he lived and labored for it. And his labor was not in vain. The Gospel of the grace of God is the Church's one treasure, and the Christian people of this land and throughout the world owe him undying thanks for guarding it so faithfully. "It was due to him [Dr. Pieper] and Walther that the *sola gratia*, in which and on which the Lutheran Church has ever lived and which she always preached, has now come to be comprehended in the Lutheran Church of our country, also theoretically, in its full import and that thereby clear and clean theological thinking has been promoted." (Dr. M. Reu in *Kirchliche Zeitschrift*. See *Lutheraner*, 1931, p. 262.) Dr. Pieper, Walther's foremost pupil, voices the thanks of the Church in these words: "We cannot but say: As the doctrine of the Church, which had been nearly forgotten also within the Lutheran Church, was again brought to light chiefly through Walther, so it is owing primarily to his testimony that the Biblical doctrine of conversion and election has not been entirely swept away

by the torrent of the adverse teaching." (*Lehre u. Wehre*, 1890, p. 243.) While Pelagianism and synergism have spread far and wide in the modern churches, a great host is proclaiming with a loud and glad voice what all Christians are saying in their heart: We owe our salvation solely to the grace of God.

The Church possesses two great treasures: the Gospel of saving grace and the inspired Word of God. Which is the greater? They go together. The Church needs both of them. And we prize the one because of the value of the other. We love the Bible because it brings the Gospel of grace to us, the one thing needful. But we lose the assurance of the truth of the Gospel if the certainty of Scripture is gone. "The validity of the Christian's hope in the several promises of the Gospel rests on the trustworthiness of the Bible." Let us faithfully guard the treasures of the Church. A grave responsibility rests upon us. The Lutheran Church holds these treasures in trust for the Church. Dr. C. E. Macartney (Presbyterian) wrote the other day: "The two great doctrines which Luther rediscovered and loosed upon the world were, first of all, the Scriptures as the final authority for the Christians and, secondly, justification by faith alone. . . . To-day the Protestant Church stands in sore need of a reemphasis and rediscovery of these two great Reformation propositions. . . . Protestantism, born out of the doctrine of salvation by grace, by faith alone, has been turning more and more back again to the weak and beggarly elements, the ill-favored doctrine of salvation by works, . . . works of charity and philanthropy, and personal character and integrity. . . ." (See *Luth. Witness*, 1934, p. 337.) A grave responsibility rests upon us who have come into the heritage of Dr. Walther. He reemphasized, for our day, the two great Reformation propositions and transmitted the treasures of the Church to our care with the solemn deprecation: May the mouth of that teacher who shall at any time utter one word "against Christ's free grace and against His alone true Word be smitten by God and stopped forever!" (Address at the corner-stone laying of Concordia Seminary, 1882. See Hochstetter, *Geschichte*, etc., p. 445.) Let us acquit ourselves as faithful pupils of Dr. Walther. And "may God grant the whole Lutheran Church, in this land and throughout the world, the grace that she may stand before the world with her escutcheon unsullied and fulfil, for the good of the whole world, her God-appointed mission: to confess the *sola gratia* on the basis of the *sola Scriptura*!" (Dr. F. Pieper, in *Lehre u. Wehre*, 1927, p. 11.)³⁾

TH. ENGELDER.

3) The reader is advised to read the series of articles by Dr. F. Pieper: "Dr. C. F. W. Walther als Theologe," in *Lehre u. Wehre*, beginning with Vol. 34, p. 97; "Walthers Verdienst um das *sola Scriptura*," by Dr. F. Bente, in *Lehre u. Wehre*, 57, p. 97 ff.; and "Walther the Lutheran," a series of articles by Dr. A. Graebner, in *Theological Quarterly*, beginning with 15, p. 66; and, in addition, Walther's own articles, essays, and books.

Ein Gutachten des seligen D. F. Pieper über Polygamie.

An die Ehrw. Kommission für Heidenmission.

Ehrw. Herren und Brüder!

Sie haben an mich unter dem 18. Januar d. J. [1926] die folgende Zuschrift gerichtet: „Die Missionskonferenz des Nagercoil-Distrikts in Indien läßt Sie durch die Kommission für Heidenmission bitten, auf die folgende Frage ein Gutachten auszustellen. Die Kommission für Heidenmission schließt sich hiermit der Bitte der Missionskonferenz an. Die Anfrage lautet: 'Resolved to submit to Dr. Pieper, through the Hon. Board, the essay on bigamy which Brother Goerss wrote at the time (1920) and the remarks of the Conference *re* Brother Goerss's essay for a clear and concise answer to the question as to how to deal with bigamists who come over to Christianity from heathendom.'“ Um ein Gutachten meinerseits zu ermöglichen, hat die Ehrw. Kommission mir das Protokoll der 44. Travancore-Konferenz überfandt.

Aus diesem Protokoll geht hervor, daß unsere Brüder in Indien ungefähr dieselben Fragen behandelt haben, die je und je in der Kirche des Neuen Testaments aufgeworfen worden sind. Alle aufgeworfenen Spezialfragen — unsere indischen Brüder haben deren zwölf eingesandt — gruppieren sich schließlich um eine Hauptfrage, nämlich um die Frage:

Ist nicht auch in der Kirche des Neuen Testaments Bigamie, resp. Polygamie, unter gewissen Umständen zu erlauben, angesichts der Tatsache, daß Gott zur Zeit des Alten Testaments sowohl vor als auch nach dem Gesetzesbunde von der Monogamie dispensiert hat?

Auch bei ernsten Theologen hat sich eine Neigung zu dem Argument gezeigt: „Was Gott zur Zeit des Alten Testaments erlaubt und sogar großen Patriarchen nachgesehen hat, kann auch zur Zeit des Neuen Testaments nicht schlecht hin, das ist, als unter allen Umständen sündlich, behandelt werden.“ Das Argument scheint berechtigt zu sein, und doch ist es verkehrt und hebt, konsequent durchgeführt, den Unterschied zwischen göttlicher und menschlicher Autorität auf. Es kommt — seiner Umhüllungen entkleidet — darauf hinaus: Wenn Gott von seinem Gesetz nachläßt oder Ausnahmen macht, so können wir Menschen daselbe tun. Von diesem Argument, das sich leicht unbewußt geltend macht, müssen wir loskommen, wenn wir von jeder Ungewißheit hinsichtlich der Zulässigkeit der Bigamie, resp. Polygamie, im Neuen Testament loskommen wollen, um mit voller Gewißheit die Monogamie zu lehren und in die Praxis überzuführen.

Wir erinnern uns an einen Punkt, der eigentlich in die Lehre von Gott (*De Deo*) gehört. Es ist der Punkt, den Luther mit dem kurzen Ausdruck bezeichnet: Gott ist „*gar exlex*“ (St. L. III, 811 ff.), das ist,

Gott steht nicht unter, sondern über seinem den Menschen gegebenen Gesetz. „Er gibt das Gesetz aus, aber er nimmt es nicht wieder hin- auf.“ „Gott hat mir vorgeschrieben, wie ich leben und ihm dienen soll; da meine ich denn, er (Gott) solle auch also leben.“ „Mit dem Nächsten (der ein Mensch ist wie du) magst du also umgehen; der hat das Gesetz; das soll er und du tun, nicht rauben, stehlen, ehebrechen usw.; aber Gott will tun, wie es ihm gefällt, und muß also tun, denn sein Wille ist das Gesetz; es kann nicht anders sein.“ Beispiele: Uns Menschen ist das Töten im fünften Gebot verboten; Gott aber tötet fortwährend, wen er will, wann er will und wie er will, z. B. Apost. 12, 23 (Herodes), Gen. 38, 8 (Onan), durch einen sogenannten natürlichen Tod, Ps. 90, 7—10, auch durch Erdbeben, Wasserfluten usw. Wenn unser St. Louiser Rabbi Harrison anlässlich des Erdbebens in Messina, wobei viele Menschen getötet wurden, sagte, er wolle mit dem Gott, der durch Erdbeben Menschen töte, nichts zu tun haben, so wissen wir, daß solche Rede Gotteslästerung ist. Ferner: Von einem irdischen Richter, das ist, von einem menschlichen Richter, wird in der Schrift gefordert, daß er den Gerechten rechtsprechen und den Ungerechten verurteilen soll, Deut. 25, 1; Spr. 17, 15. Gott aber achtet sich an dieses den Menschen gegebene Gesetz nicht gebunden. Er hat Christus, der von keiner Sünde wußte, für uns zur Sünde gemacht, 2 Kor. 5, 21, und spricht nun um Christi willen uns Gottlose (τὸν ἀσεβῆ) gerecht, Röm. 4, 5. Weil rationalisierende Theologen, insonderheit auch die modernen Theologen, Gott an das den Menschen gegebene Gesetz gebunden erachten, so leugnen sie die satisfactio vicaria und die christliche Lehre von der Rechtfertigung, nämlich die Rechtfertigung durch den Glauben an Christi Gerechtigkeit ohne des Menschen eigene Tugend und Werke. Wir sehen daraus, daß Gott sich nicht an das den Menschen gegebene Gesetz gebunden erachtet, ohne daß dadurch das Gesetz für die Menschen hinfällig würde. Dies findet, wie uns die Schrift lehrt, auch Anwendung auf Gottes Ehegesetzgebung. Beispiele: Die Geschwistereihe ist 3 Mos. 18, 9 verboten und Kap. 20, 17 mit Todesstrafe belegt. Aber beim ersten Menschengeschlecht hat Gott die Geschwistereihe geordnet, weil er wollte, daß alle Menschen, die auf dem ganzen Erdboden wohnen, aus einem Blut (ἐκ ἑνὸς αἵματος) herkommen sollten. Gott hat auch 3 Mos. 18, 9. 11 die Ehe mit der Halbschwester verboten und Kap. 20, 17 ebenfalls mit Todesstrafe belegt. Dennoch hat Gott an dem Patriarchen Abraham die Ehe mit der Halbschwester nachgelassen oder übersehen, Gen. 20, 12: „Sie [Sara] ist wahrhaftig meine Schwester; denn sie ist meines Vaters Tochter, aber nicht meiner Mutter Tochter, und ist mein Weib worden.“ Ferner: 3 Mos. 18, 16 ist des verstorbenen Bruders Weib verboten, aber 5 Mos. 25, 5. 6 in einem bestimmten Fall geboten, in dem Fall nämlich, wenn der Bruder ohne männliche Erben gestorben war (Leviratshe; Zweck: des verstorbenen Bruders Name sollte aus Israel nicht getilgt werden).

Wir sehen hieraus: Aus der Tatsache, daß Gott zur Zeit des Alten Testaments von seinem Ehegesetz dispensiert hat, können wir nicht sicher schließen, daß uns im Neuen Testament ein Gleiches zu tun erlaubt sei.

Alles kommt nun darauf an, daß wir aus der Schrift klar erkennen, welche Ordnung Gott für die Kirche des Neuen Testaments festgelegt hat, speziell was Monogamie und Polygamie betrifft.

Unser Heiland gibt uns Matth. 19 auf die Frage, ob Bigamie, resp. Polygamie, unter gewissen Umständen erlaubt sei, eine so klare Antwort, daß Lehrer und Laien allem Zweifel entnommen werden. Mit Recht haben unsere Brüder in Indien unter den von ihnen vorgelegten Fragen die Stelle Matth. 19 in den Vordergrund gerückt. Gehen wir auf die Fragen der Reihe nach ein.

1. Was Gen. 2, 24 cited by Christ Matt. 19, 6 with the intention of proving any more than the indissolubility of the marriage bond?

Sehen wir zunächst Matth. 19 genau an. An dieser Stelle sagt Christus zweierlei: a. Gott hat zur Zeit des Alten Testaments Bigamie, resp. Polygamie, wirklich erlaubt. Dies bezeugt Christus in den Worten B. 8: „Moses hat euch erlaubt, ἐπέτρεψεν ὑμῖν, eure Weiber zu entlassen.“ b. Diese von Moses erlaubte Entlassung eures Weibes ist aber gegen die ursprüngliche Ordnung Gottes, und diese ursprüngliche göttliche Ordnung soll jetzt wieder die allein geltende Ordnung sein. Dies spricht Christus aus in den unmittelbar folgenden Worten, B. 9: „Ich sage euch aber: Wer sein Weib entläßt, es sei denn um Hurerei willen, und eine andere (ἄλλην) heiratet, der begeht Ehebruch (μοιχάται); und wer die Entlassene heiratet, begeht Ehebruch (μοιχάται).“ Und dieses nicht bloß auf Sünde, sondern auf Ehebruch lautende Urteil begründet der Heiland mit dem Hinweis auf Gottes ursprüngliche Ordnung, die auf Monogamie lautet, B. 4. 5: „Habt ihr nicht gelesen, daß, der im Anfang den Menschen gemacht hat, der machte, daß ein Mann und Weib sein sollte (ἄρσεν καὶ θήλυ ἐποίησεν αὐτούς), und sprach: Darum wird ein Mensch Vater und Mutter verlassen und an seinem Weibe hangen, und werden die zwei ein Fleisch sein“ (καὶ ἔσονται οἱ δύο εἰς σάρκα μίαν)? In bezug auf die ersten Worte: Gott hat im Anfang ἄρσεν καὶ θήλυ, ein männliches Wesen und ein weibliches Wesen, gemacht, möchte jemand noch meinen, daß in diesen Worten nur die Zweigeschlechtlichkeit der Menschheit, nicht aber die Monogamie gelehrt sei. Aber diese Meinung ist ausgeschlossen, sobald wir die unmittelbar folgenden Worte hinzunehmen: Καὶ ἔσονται οἱ δύο εἰς σάρκα μίαν. Hier werden die Personen ausdrücklich gezählt, die ein Fleisch werden sollen. Nur zwei Personen, nicht mehr — das liegt in dem Gegensatz von δύο und μίαν —, hat Gott in seiner Schöpferordnung zu dieser wunderbaren ehelichen Einheit zusammengefügt. Deshalb läßt der Herr die Mahnung folgen, B. 6: „Was nun Gott zusammengefügt hat, das soll der Mensch nicht scheiden.“ Falls der Mensch eine Scheidung vornimmt, außer im Falle des Ehebruchs, wodurch der andere

Teil das Eheband schon aufgelöst hat, so begehrt der Mensch Ehebruch, πορνεία, und das fortgesetzte eheliche Zusammenleben mit einer andern weiblichen Person als mit der, mit der er bereits ein Fleisch geworden ist, ist fortgesetzter Ehebruch. Matth. 19 macht wirklich aller Disputation, ob auch im Neuen Testament Bigamie, resp. Polygamie, erlaubt sei, ein Ende.

Kommen wir jetzt auf Frage 1 zurück. Sie lautet: "Was Gen. 2, 24 cited by Christ Matt. 19, 6 with the intention of proving any more than the indissolubility of the marriage bond?" Antwort: Sicherlich nicht. Der Heiland will nur die Unauflöslichkeit des Ehebandes einschärfen. Aber die Unauflöslichkeit des Ehebandes begründet der Heiland mit der Tatsache, daß nach Gottes ursprünglicher und im Neuen Testament geltender Ordnung nicht mehr als zwei Personen ein Fleisch werden sollen.

Zu Frage 2. Damit ist auch bereits Frage 2 beantwortet:

2. Do Gen. 2, 24 and Matt. 19, 6 preclude that a man may lawfully be one flesh with more than one woman?

Allerdings ist das durch die genannten Stellen ausgeschlossen. Weil in diesen Stellen Monogamie als law festgelegt ist, so ist dadurch ausgeschlossen, daß jemand mit mehr als einem Weibe "lawfully" ein Fleisch sein könne in Übereinstimmung mit dem Willen Gottes. — Zu Frage 2 haben die indischen Brüder noch die Frage hinzugefügt:

St. Paul says 1 Cor. 6, 16: "Know ye not that he which is joined to an harlot is one body? For two, saith He, shall be one flesh." Are not some of those who are "joined to harlots" married men, who have lawful spouses with whom they are one flesh?

Antwort: Leider ist das oft so. Aber weil solche Männer bereits mit ihren lawful Frauen ein Fleisch sind, so werden sie dadurch, daß sie auch noch mit der Hure ein Fleisch werden, zu Hurern. Und die Abscheulichkeit der Hurerei (πορνεία) ins Licht zu stellen, ist die Intention der Stelle: Φεύετε τὴν πορνείαν. Sind die, welche zur Hure gehen, Christen, so kommt der erschwerende Umstand noch dazu, daß sie ihren Leib, der doch nur einem, nämlich Christo, gehört, zur Hure tragen; denn die unio mystica, die zwischen jedem Christen und Christo stattfindet, erstreckt sich auch auf den Leib des Christen und auf alle Glieder des Leibes.

3. 1 Cor. 7, 4 has been cited to prove that a married man may not marry a second wife though the first wife consent. But it does not seem to prove this conclusively since a man who marries a second wife with the consent of his first wife can hardly be said to have arrogated the disposing power of his body to himself.

Antwort: Der ersten Frau ist nicht erlaubt, ihren Konsens zum Nehmen einer zweiten Frau neben ihr zu geben, weil dies gegen die göttliche Ordnung im Neuen Testament wäre, die auf Monogamie lautet.

4. Brother Goerss quoted Dr. Graebner's paper (Minn. Dist., 1892), in which the learned doctor says that Lev. 18, 18 condemned bigamy and polygamy. But do we not, as a rule, take words in their literal sense where it is possible? If this rule is followed, we should translate אחות with "sister," as Luther's and the King James Version of the Bible have it. And even if we follow Dr. Graebner and translate אחות with "another," the לָצַר and the בְּחַיִּיהָ are perhaps more of a hindrance than a help to proving that bigamy or polygamy was under no circumstances to be tolerated; for under certain circumstances a woman may not be "vexed" by her husband's marriage with a second woman.

Antwort: In bezug auf Lev. 18, 18 ist die Frage erhoben und verschieden beantwortet worden, ob dort die Bigamie mit zwei Frauen überhaupt oder die Bigamie mit zwei leiblichen Schwestern (wie bei Jakob) verboten sei. Da nun aus Matth. 19 klar hervorgeht, daß die Bigamie in jeder Form im Neuen Testament wider die göttliche Ordnung ist, so können wir die Frage, welche besondere Form der Bigamie Lev. 18, 18 verboten sei, auf sich beruhen lassen. Auch die Frage kann die klare Sachlage nur verwirren, ob nicht etwa das Verbot der Bigamie durch das לָצַר beschränkt sei. Denn einerlei, ob die erste Frau zur Bigamie ihre Zustimmung gibt oder dadurch "vexed" ist: Bigamie widerspricht der im Neuen Testament von Christo festgestellten — genauer ausgedrückt: wieder festgestellten — göttlichen Ordnung, daß nur zwei Personen ein Fleisch werden sollen. — über Lev. 18, 18 sei nebenbei dies bemerkt: Auch alte lutherische Theologen, namentlich seit Hakenreffer (gestorben 1619 zu Tübingen), finden an dieser Stelle ein Verbot der Bigamie schlechthin. Und es muß zugegeben werden, daß, wenn er sprachlich und außerhalb des Kontextes angesehen wird, der Ausdruck „ein Weib zu ihrer Schwester“ so viel heißen kann als „ein Weib zum andern“ oder „zwei Weiber zu gleicher Zeit“. Dies geht aus Hesek. 1, 9, 23 und 2 Mos. 16, 15 hervor. Aber wir behalten sicheren Grund unter den Füßen, wenn wir 3 Mos. 18, 18 אחות in seinem ersten Sinn von leiblicher Verwandtschaft unter Menschen verstehen, weil אחות im vorhergehenden nur in diesem Sinn gebraucht sind. Dadurch werden wir veranlaßt, V. 18 dahin zu verstehen, daß hier den Juden die Verufung auf Jakobs Beispiel abgeschnitten werden soll, der — wenn auch eigentlich wider seinen Willen — zwei leibliche Schwestern zur Ehe genommen hatte. So erklärt sich auch ganz leicht לָצַר und בְּחַיִּיהָ, gerade wie V. 11 noch einmal besonders die Halbschwester verboten wird, obwohl V. 9 die Halbschwester schon mitverboten war. Es geschieht dies, um den Juden die Verufung auf den Fall Abrahams abzuschneiden.

5. Deut. 21, 10—17 contains an express permission of bigamy. Can one find so unmistakable a passage in the New Testament in condemnation of bigamy?

Sicherlich; Christus erklärt Matth. 19, daß das seinerzeit von Moses ausgestellte Permit nicht mehr gelte.

6. Deut. 22, 28, 29 makes it obligatory for a man who violates a virgin to marry her. The question whether the man be married or not does not seem to come into consideration.

Letzteres zugegeben, so steht aus Matth. 19 fest, daß ein bereits verheirateter Mann zur Zeit des Neuen Testaments so etwas nicht tun darf.

7. It has been said that instances of polygamy related in the Scriptures show that the Scriptures "impartially account the truth as it happened and exhibit both the innate sinfulness even of believers and the patience of God in bearing with them." But is it clearly and expressly said anywhere in the Bible that the patriarchs sinned by living in polygamy?

In der Bibel ist gesagt, daß Gott zur Zeit des Alten Testaments in bezug auf seine Ehegesetze Dispensation erteilt hat. Das kommt uns sonderbar vor, weil wir leicht meinen, auch Gott stehe unter seinem den Menschen gegebenen Gesetz. Deshalb sagt Luther gegen Lening (Neobulius): „Gott ist der Herr; er mag Gesetz aufheben, ändern, lindern, wie er will, aus Not oder ohne Not. Aber das gebührt uns nicht nachzutun, viel weniger, ein Recht zu stiften, das gelten müsse oder Recht werden.“

8. 1 Tim. 3, 2 teaches that a bishop may not have more than one wife. If a bishop who is to teach others by example as well as by precept is to have only one wife, one may draw the conclusion that lay Christians are also not to have more than one wife. But does not the fact that it was expressly said that a bishop should be the husband of *one* wife seem to prove that it was tolerated in the early Church if a man had more than one wife? And was this perhaps tolerated because many of the Gentiles had two or more wives when they became Christians?

Der vielverwendete Schluß: Weil Monogamie bei einem Bischof ausdrücklich gefordert wird, so wurde bei Laien Bigamie wohl toleriert, ist ein falscher Schluß. Bei einem Bischof wurde auch ausdrücklich gefordert, daß er nicht ein Weinsäufer sei, 1 Tim. 3, 3. Daraus aber zu folgern, daß die apostolische Kirche an Laien Weinsäuferei duldet, wäre gegen Schriftstellen wie 1 Kor. 6, 10: „Die Trunkenbolde . . . werden das Reich Gottes nicht ererben.“

9. Dr. Walther says in his *Pastorale* that Mohammedans and heathens who have been living in polygamy must dismiss all but the first of their so-called wives on becoming converts to Christianity. Dr. Warneck says that the consent of the wife to be dismissed is necessary.

D. Walther richtet sich nach Matth. 19, D. Warneck nicht.

10. Dr. Luther and others haltingly consented to the Landgrave Philip of Hesse's secretly marrying a second wife when the prince swore that he could not overcome the temptation to promiscuous fornication otherwise, and in reading Luther's correspondence on this subject with the prince and others the thought suggests itself that Luther might have defended the prince publicly if bigamy or polygamy had not been forbidden by the law of the empire and if it had not been for the public offense that would have been caused. Luther used some strong language in his reply to Johann Lening's published defense of the prince's action, but Luther's reply was not completed, and he never had it published.

11. Luther seems to have held that a person having a spouse afflicted with leprosy or something similar was justified in marrying a second one if not in getting a divorce from the first. (Vol. XXIa, 928.)

Bei dem Landgrafen handelte es sich, wie richtig gesagt wird, um eine heimliche Nebenehe. Deshalb deckt sich der landgräfliche Fall nicht mit den Fällen, um die es sich in Indien handeln würde. In den indischen Fällen würde öffentliche Bigamie vorliegen.

Die Annahme, daß Luther auch öffentliche Bigamie verteidigt haben würde, wenn sie nicht staatlich verboten gewesen wäre und in dieser Beziehung ein öffentliches Ärgernis vorgelegen hätte, läßt sich nicht halten. Dies geht auch aus der „starken Sprache“ hervor, die Luther gegen Lening (Neobolus) gebrauchte, als dieser in einem Buch die landgräfliche Bigamie verteidigt hatte. Luther gebraucht allerdings „some strong language“, weil er sagt: „Wer diesem Buben (Neobolus) und seinem Buche folgt und darauf mehr denn eine Ehefrau nimmt und will, daß es Recht sein soll, dem gesegne der Teufel das Bad im Abgrund der Hölle. Amen. Das weiß ich wohl zu erhalten.“ Luther argumentiert hier auch nicht bloß mit dem Staatsgesetz und mit dem Ärgernis, das sich aus der Übertretung des Staatsgesetzes ergeben würde, sondern er weist auch wiederholt darauf hin, daß uns im Neuen Testament die dispensatio fehlt, die bei „Vätern und Mose“ vorlag. Er sagt: „Da er (Neobolus) die Väter und Mose einführet, habe ich droben gesagt, es hilft nichts. Moses ist tot. Lasset's aber gleich sein, daß es bei den Vätern und Mose ein Recht gewesen wäre, als nimmermehr kann bewiesen werden, so hatten sie da Gottes Wort, das ihnen zuließ; das haben wir nicht.“ Ebenso schreibt Luther im Jahre 1526 (St. L. XXIa, 902) an Joseph Levin Meßich, der gefragt hatte, „ob jemand möge mehr denn ein Weib zur Ehe haben“: „Ob die Alten viel Weiber gehabt, ist doch Christen nicht zu tun nach solchem Exempel, weil da keine Not noch Verrückung noch sonderlich Wort Gottes ist, das solches befiehlt, und so groß Ärgernis und Unruh' daraus kommen möcht'. Derhalben ich es nicht den Christen mehr frei achte.“

Des Landgrafen Nebenehe mit Margareta von der Saale, wozu die

sehr gebrechliche Landgräfin ihren Konsens gegeben hatte, kam vor Luther und Melancthon als Beichtgeheimnis. Beide erschrakten, gaben aber schließlich, um Ärgernis zu vermeiden, zögernd, nicht „williglich und gern“ (wie Luther an den Kurfürsten von Sachsen schreibt), ihre Zustimmung unter der Voraussetzung, daß die Sache geheim gehalten werde.

Einerlei ob Luther geirrt oder unter den Umständen recht gehandelt hat, so müssen wir festhalten, daß wir unsere Gewissen nicht auf Luthers Autorität, sondern allein auf Gottes Wort zu gründen haben. Luther erinnert in seinem Kommentar zum 1. Petribrief daran (zu 1 Petr. 3, 15), daß jeder Christ in Sachen der christlichen Lehre sich auf einen starken Spruch der Schrift gründen müsse, da in der Todesstunde weder Papst noch Luther bei ihm sein werde. (St. L. IX, 1236.) Einen solchen starken Spruch haben wir Matth. 19, wodurch Moses mit seiner Dispensation für uns im Neuen Testament „tot“ ist, wie Luther sagt. Jeder Fall von Bigamie ist nun Sünde vor Gott und, wenn er öffentlich wird, ein öffentliches Ärgernis. Das haben auch Luther und Melancthon sehr reichlich erfahren. Als des Landgrafen Bigamie, wie zu erwarten war, bekannt wurde, da trug Luther, wie er dem Landgrafen schreibt, „wahrlich schwer genug an der Sache“. Melancthon fiel noch besonders aufs Gewissen, daß er bei einer Art öffentlicher Hochzeitsfeier, der Luther ganz widerraten hatte, zugegen war, eigentlich durch Betrug dazu veranlaßt. Wir hier in der Heimatskirche und unsere Brüder in Indien würden ebenfalls in große Gewissensnot kommen, wenn wir zu entscheiden hätten, in welchen Fällen an der Monogamie festzuhalten und in welchen Fällen Dispens zu erteilen sei. Wir würden aus der Gewissensnot gar nicht herauskommen. Darum wollen wir Gott danken, daß Christus Matth. 19 die Monogamie als unverbrüchliche Regel aufstellt und für das Lehren derselben und auch für die praktische Durchführung die ganze Verantwortung übernimmt. Ein Doppeltes hat je und je den Gedanken nahegelegt, auf die strikte Durchführung der Monogamie zu verzichten. 1. Sie wird als ein Hindernis für die Ausbreitung der christlichen Kirche in bigamistischen, resp. polygamistischen, Ländern empfunden. Dagegen erinnern wir uns daran, daß unserm Heiland die Ausbreitung seiner Kirche sicherlich noch mehr am Herzen liegt als uns. Wenn nun die Durchführung der Monogamie wirklich ein Hindernis für die Mission wäre, so hätte er die Kirche des Neuen Testaments nicht so streng auf die Monogamie verpflichtet, wie dies Matth. 19 der Fall ist. 2. Es wird als eine Grausamkeit empfunden, wenn wir den aus dem Heidentum Befeierten, die nach Landesitte Bigamisten waren, es zur Pflicht machen, die zweite Frau zu entlassen. Aber nachdem Bigamisten Christen geworden sind, treibt sie der in ihrem Herzen wohnende Heilige Geist auch dazu, Christi Wort und Gebot ihre Lebensregel sein zu lassen. Sie lesen auch Matth. 19 und werden nicht eher ein ruhiges Gewissen bekommen, als bis sie Christi monogamischer

Lebensregel untertan geworden sind. Ein unruhiges, zweifelndes Gewissen ist ein gefährlicher Seelenzustand. Diesen letzteren Punkt mußten wir im Auge behalten, wenn wir veranlaßt waren, als Fakultät in Ehefachen Gutachten abzugeben, sei es in Ehefachen überhaupt, sei es in bezug auf Bigamie im besonderen. Obwohl wir in einem Lande leben, in dem die Bigamie gesetzlich verboten ist, so gibt es doch auch bei uns immer Leute, die in der Form Bigamisten sind oder werden wollen, daß sie ihr Ehegemahl wegen „unheilbarer Krankheit“ verlassen und sich wieder verheiratet haben oder doch aus demselben Grunde ihr Ehegemahl zu verlassen gedenken.

Unsere teuren indischen Brüder sind zu ermuntern, daß sie getrosten Mutes bei der Praxis bleiben, die sie bisher in bezug auf Bigamie, resp. Polygamie, befolgt haben.

Einer Ehrw. Kommission für Heidenmission ergebenster Diener
Geschrieben in den Osterferien 1926. F. Pieper.

Der Schriftgrund für die Lehre von der satisfactio vicaria.

(Fortsetzung.)

Offenb. 1, 5: Und von Jesu Christo, der (da ist der) treue Zeuge, der Erstgeborne der Toten und der Herrscher der Könige der Erde, ihm, der uns liebt und erlöst hat von unsern Sünden durch sein Blut.

B. 5 des ersten Kapitels der Apokalypse ist ein Teil des leitenden Grußes, womit der Apostel seine Aufzeichnungen von den besonderen Offenbarungen beginnt, die ihm durch Christum gegeben worden sind. Der heilige Schreiber wünscht seinen Lesern Gnade und Frieden von dem, der da war und der da ist und der da kommt, und von den sieben Geistern, aber auch von Jesu Christo, dem Heiland der Menschen, der durch sein dreifaches Amt die Erlösung der ganzen Welt zustande gebracht hat.

In der ihm in der Apokalypse eigenen Grammatik setzt Johannes nun die angefangene Konstruktion nicht fort, sondern gebraucht in der Apposition den Nominativ. Jesus Christus ist nicht nur der treue, zuverlässige Zeuge, was sein Wort und seine evangelische Verkündigung anlangt, sondern er ist auch insofern ein *μάρτυς θεός*, als er sich eben durch seinen Tod als ein Zeuge Gottes geoffenbart hat. Der Gedanke des Evangeliums von der Stellvertretung liegt auch in der folgenden Bezeichnung: der Erstgeborne der Toten oder aus den Toten. Nicht nur war das ganze Lebenswerk Christi bis zu seinem Tode, der auch in diesem Zusammenhang der Höhepunkt seines Amtes war, ein für die Wahrheit abgelegtes Zeugnis, sondern er ist auch — in konsequenter Handlung und Stellung in seinem Wort- und Tatbekenntnis — der Erste unter oder aus den Toten, der aus dem Tode zu neuem

Leben wiedergeboren wurde. Seine Auferstehung als Erster von den Toten gibt allen Gläubigen die Zusicherung, daß der Tod alle, die sich zu ihm als dem Heiland halten, die mit ihm in der wahren Glaubensgemeinschaft verbunden sind, nicht von ihm trennen kann. Ist er, unser Haupt, als Erster von den Toten auferstanden, so werden auch wir nicht im Tode bleiben, sondern kraft seiner Auferstehung zum Leben zurückgerufen werden. Dabei wird im Text auch hingewiesen auf die Herrschaft Christi über die Könige der Erde, um damit gleichsam anzudeuten, daß schließlich alle Pläne der Weltherrscher dem Heiland nach seinem Wohlgefallen dienen müssen. Vgl. Ps. 89, 28; Matth. 4, 8, 9.

Im Anschluß an diesen Gedanken nun bricht der heilige Schreiber aus in eine kurze, aber inhaltreiche Dogologie: Ihm (dem), der uns liebt. Mit Absicht ist das Präsens gesetzt; denn die ewige Liebe des Heilandes, die sich in seinem ganzen Leben, Leiden und Sterben erzeugte, bezeugt sich noch jetzt, eben an uns, die wir durch seine Gnade zum Glauben gekommen sind und das Wunder seiner Liebe einigermaßen einzuschätzen uns bemühen. Der höchste Beweis der Liebe des Heilandes liegt in seinem stellvertretenden Tod, der fortwährend seine Kraft an uns ausübt und uns darum dauernd in seiner Liebe behält.

Wie die Liebe des Heilandes aber eine fortdauernde Betätigung seinerseits und eine stete Erfahrung unsererseits ist, so beruht die damit verbundene Gewißheit auf der Tatsache, daß er uns von unsern Sünden erlöst hat durch sein Blut. Die Sündhaftigkeit der Menschen ist eine Tatsache, die von vornherein feststeht. Wir alle sind mit Sünden behaftet, wir alle sind schuldig vor seinem heiligen Angesicht. Aber er hat uns von unsern Sünden erlöst, befreit, losgekauft, er hat das Lösegeld erlegt. Und das Lösegeld ist nichts Geringeres als sein Blut. Dabei ist es instrumental zu fassen. Unsere Erlösung von unsern Sünden ist geschehen durch sein Blut, auf Kosten seines Blutes, seines eigenen Lebens. Er hat sein Blut für uns vergossen, um uns dadurch zu erlösen und ihm zu erkaufen, auf daß wir sein eigen seien und in seinem Reiche unter ihm leben und ihm dienen in ewiger Gerechtigkeit, Unschuld und Seligkeit. Das ist klare Aussage dieses Verses.

Offenb. 5, 9: Und sie sangen ein neues Lied, indem sie sprachen: Würdig bist du, zu nehmen das Buch und zu öffnen seine Siegel; denn du wurdest geschlachtet und hast Gotte erkauft durch dein Blut (Leute) aus jedem Geschlecht und Zunge und Nation und Volk.

Es wird uns hier eine Szene aus dem großen apokalyptischen Drama vorgeführt, worin der himmlische Chor der vier Lebewesen und der vierundzwanzig Ältesten ein Loblied zu Ehren des Lammes anstimmt. Sie sangen ein neues Lied, ein Lied, das in dieser Form zuvor nicht gebraucht und gehört worden war. Vgl. Jes. 42, 9, 10; 43, 18; Ps. 40, 4. Das Lied sagt zunächst aus, daß das Lamm würdig ist, das

versiegelte Buch zu nehmen und dessen Siegel zu öffnen. Er, der Sohn Gottes, der zugleich das Lamm Gottes ist, dessen stellvertretendes Werk von Gott angenommen worden ist, ist der einzige, dem dieses Recht und diese Ehre zukommt.

Dies wird nun im folgenden erhärtet: *De n n d u w u r d e s t g e s c h l a c h t e t*. Damit ist das Hauptmoment im Erlösungswerke Christi, sein Opfertod, in den Mittelpunkt gerückt. Er ist nach den Worten des Propheten wie ein Lamm, das zur Schlachtbank geführt wird, Jes. 53, 7. Er hat sich selber Gotte geopfert, und er ist als das geduldige Schlachtlämmlein geschlachtet und geopfert worden. Und durch dieses Opfer, das unser Hoherpriester für uns gebracht hat, indem er sich selbst in den Tod gab, hat er erkauft. Als Objekt ist zu ergänzen nicht „einige“, „gewisse“, sondern „Leute“, „Personen“ im allgemeinen. Diese hat der Heiland erkauft, ἡγόρασας. In Kap. 1, 5 steht λύσαντι, womit die Tatsache der Loskaufung betont werden sollte. Das Verbum ἀγοράζειν wird in den Papyrusdokumenten fast regelmäßig gebraucht vom Kaufen der Sklaven. Damit ist angedeutet, daß Christus uns sich erkauft, daß er durch Erlegung des Lösegeldes seines Blutes uns zu seinem Eigentum gemacht hat. Aber damit ist zugleich ausgesagt, daß wir Gotte erkauft sind, daß wir durch die Erlösung, so durch Jesum Christum geschehen ist, Eigentum Gottes geworden sind. In der Gemeinschaft mit Christo stehen wir auch in der Gemeinschaft mit Gott. Der Kaufpreis ist bestimmt genannt als das Blut des Heilandes. Die Erlösung ist geschehen durch sein Blut. Christus hat sich alle Menschen erkauft (1 Kor. 6, 20; 7, 23; 2 Petr. 2, 1; 1 Tim. 2, 6), und allen Menschen wird die durch sein Blut geschehene Erlösung angeboten.

A n m e r k u n g. Hierher gehören auch als Beweisprüche Offenb. 7, 14 und 12, 11, weil die Ausdrücke ἐν τῷ αἵματι τοῦ ἀρνίου, διὰ τὸ αἷμα τοῦ ἀρνίου die ganze stellvertretende Genugtuung des Heilandes voraussetzen und darauf beruhen. Das Blut des Lammes hat stellvertretenderweise die Erlösung der Menschen erworben, und darum ist das Blut Christi das ausschlaggebende Moment in der Erlösungsgeschichte und in der Anwendung der Erlösung auf uns.

P. E. R.

The Norm and Rule of Doctrine in the Christian Church before the Reformation.

That the Gospel of Christ Crucified is contrary to all worldly wisdom is clearly affirmed by St. Paul in his First Letter to the Corinthians, 1, 18 ff. He therefore warned the Colossians: "Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ," 2, 8, and speaks of himself as "casting down imaginations and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of

Christ," 2 Cor. 10, 8. In the Church of Christ the Word of God should be the only norm and rule of doctrine. Not reason, but God's Word should reign supreme. At first, however, the Christian Church had no written Word of God except the Old Testament and was therefore entirely dependent on the oral teachings of the apostles. But when the New Testament came into existence, these writings gradually supplanted the oral tradition as the norm and rule of Christian doctrine.

The apostles were rightly regarded as the inspired teachers of the Church; for Christ Himself had said that "through their word" men would believe on Him, John 17, 20. They themselves stated that the Spirit of Christ spoke through them, 1 Pet. 1, 11. 12; 2 Cor. 13, 3; and therefore they insisted upon an absolute submission to their word as the Word of God. But already at that time there were false prophets, who declared that they had received special revelations or pointed to some word or letter falsely attributed to St. Paul. Over against these pretended revelations or traditions or writings St. Paul referred not only to his genuine teaching, but also to his written word. "Hold the traditions which ye have been taught, whether by word or our epistle," 2 Thess. 2, 15. Here he insists on submission not only to his oral word, but also to his written word; and in order that men might be able to distinguish his genuine writings from those which were spurious, he added his own signature to his letters, 2 Thess. 3, 17. Somewhat later, when he wrote to the Corinthians, he no longer referred to his oral word. Why not? Because in his absence the Corinthians could not absolutely be certain of his oral teaching. He therefore referred only to his written word and demanded their submission to this written word. "If a man think himself to be a prophet or spiritual, let him acknowledge that the things *that I write unto you* are the commandments of the Lord. But if a man be ignorant, let him be ignorant," 1 Cor. 14, 37. 38. We see how the written word was gradually given the place of supreme authority. Now, when the authors were gone, when the living teachers were no longer at hand to correct the errorists, then the Church acknowledged the *written* word as the norm and rule of Christian doctrine. In a controversy the written word was decisive. Ignatius, bishop of Antioch († 107), writes: "For I heard some men saying: 'If I find it not in the charters [*ἀρχαίαις*, old writings], in the gospel, I do not believe.' And when I said to them: 'It is written,' they answered me: 'That is the question.'"¹⁾

During the first millennium of the Christian era the greater part of the Christian Church employed human wisdom and learning primarily to prove the supremacy of the Christian faith and to gain

1) *Ad Philad.*, 8, 2.

acknowledgment for it in the world. Worldly wisdom was made subservient to the Christian faith. This is especially true of the West; in the East many of the theologians were inclined to philosophize. However, at the turn of the second millennium, when the Christian faith was universally accepted in the Western world (it being, as it were, laid down and fixed in the writings of the Church Fathers and the decrees of the church councils), men began to speculate concerning that faith and to employ reason, not in defense of the faith, but for the love and joy of speculating. By reason men sought to fathom the mysteries of the Christian religion. Yet another change took place towards the end of the thirteenth century. Instead of the former idealistic Augustinian speculation we have in this period an intellectualistic Aristotelian rationalism. This was due to the fact that the works of Aristotle had meanwhile become better known to the Western world, and in a very short time this pagan philosopher assumed a place of authority within the Christian Church; for his dialectical methods were employed by all the Schoolmen. On the basis of Aristotelian dialectics the separate doctrines were divided and subdivided, and this soon degenerated into hair-splitting arguments and a mere wrangling over words.

Another point must be mentioned here. Before this time the Neo-Platonic Augustinian cognition theory was universally accepted. According to this theory, truth in man is a reflection of the truth in God. Reason, if illuminated by the grace of God, can to a certain extent fathom the mysteries of faith. Owing to the influence of Aristotle this theory was now rejected, and in its place it was taught that reason has the innate power without the infusion of grace to grasp some of the mysteries of faith. The supreme authority in doctrine is revelation. The theologian is not to prove revelation by reason; for this would be altogether impossible since revelation is above reason. Nevertheless the theologian should try to demonstrate that the doctrines of the Church are not impossible. The task of theology is therefore not to set forth the doctrines of the Bible, but to explain, harmonize, and demonstrate the doctrines of the Church to be reasonable. It was taken for granted that they were Scriptural. Thomas Aquinas had held that some divine truths, *e. g.*, that of the Holy Trinity, surpass human reason and cannot be demonstrated by reason, while others are comprehensible by reason, though only slowly and after a most laborious study. In later years the theologians taught that not a single Christian doctrine could be demonstrated by reason; some of them were even contrary to reason, and therefore all must be relegated to the sphere of faith. Yet these theologians did not therefore reject the Christian doctrines, but gladly submitted to the authority of the Church, declaring, "I believe what the Church believes." This continued until Martin Luther cast the "accursed

pagan" out of the temple of God and restored the Scriptures as the sole norm and rule of doctrine within the Church. Then theology again became the answer to the question, not, "Is it reasonable?" or, "What does the Church believe?" but, "What say the Scriptures?"

The Christian Church first came in conflict with human speculation in its encounter with Gnosticism. The Gnostics attempted to construct a religious philosophy on a Christian basis; but Gnosticism was less logical than speculative. Lipsius says: "Gnosticism was the first comprehensive attempt to construct a philosophy of Christianity; owing, however, to the immense reach of the speculative ideas which pressed themselves on the attention of the Gnostics, but with which they were wholly lacking in scientific ability to cope, this attempt ended only in mysticism, theosophy, mythology, in short, in a thoroughly unphilosophical system."²)

The Christian Church was successful in its encounter with the vagaries of Gnosticism. But soon the Platonic Logos doctrine gained a foothold within the Church and corrupted the Scriptural doctrine of the person of the Redeemer. It was this corruption of the Scriptural doctrine which caused the Christian Church to engage in the prolonged Trinitarian and Christological controversies.

The Platonic influence was first felt in Justin Martyr († 166), who embraced Christianity after wandering to and fro through the various philosophical schools of his day. Justin, whom Eusebius calls "a genuine defender of true philosophy," regarded Christianity as the highest philosophy. To him Christ was the embodiment of the preexistent, absolute, personal Reason, the Logos incarnate. Every man is a partaker of the divine Logos, and according to the measure of doing this he will apprehend the truth. Whatever is reasonable is therefore Christian, and therefore even the pagan philosophers who lived according to reason were Christians, even though they may have been regarded as atheists.

Clement of Alexandria († ca. 220) also wandered through Hellenic philosophy before he embraced the Christian faith. He, too, regarded Christianity as the highest philosophy, the true philosophy, and the whole of truth in contradistinction to the conceptions of the ante-Christian times, which he regarded as partial truth. The heathen philosophers were able to discover some elements of truth by the aid of the seed of the divine Logos implanted in every man. Human reason and philosophy therefore aid in advancing from faith (πίστις) to knowledge (γνῶσις). Whoever seeks to attain the true knowledge without the aid of philosophy, dialectics, and the study of the natural sciences is like the man who expects to gather grapes without cultivating the grape-vine.

2) Quoted in Ueberweg, *History of Philosophy* (Morris-Porter ed.), Vol. I, p. 282.

Origen († 254), born of Christian parents, received at the hands of his father and of Clement a very thorough Christian education. At the age of eighteen years he assumed the office of president of the catechetical school at Alexandria, made vacant by the flight of Clement. To fill this important office, he studied not only the various heresies of his day, but also Greek philosophy; he even became a pupil of Ammonius Saccas, the founder of Neo-Platonism. Imbued with Greek philosophy, Origen now sought to reconcile Christianity and philosophy, and this led him into various speculations, which were later condemned by the Church as heretical.

In the East many of the theologians laid great emphasis on knowledge, and to them Christianity was merely the highest wisdom, the true and final philosophy; but in the West the theologians avoided speculation and dealt with practical things. In the East there was an inclination to philosophize, while in the West there was an aversion to all philosophical speculation.

Irenaeus (ca. 177), known mainly for his opposition to the Gnostic speculation, regarded the apostolic doctrine as handed down by the Church as the true *gnosis*. He writes: "It is therefore better and more profitable to belong to the simple and unlettered class and by means of love to attain to nearness to God than, by imagining ourselves learned and skilful, to be found [among those who are] blasphemous. . . . It is therefore better, as I have said, that one should have no knowledge whatever of any one reason why a single thing in creation has been made, but should believe in God and continue in His love than that, puffed up through knowledge of this kind, he should fall from that love which is the life of man and that he should search after no knowledge except Jesus Christ, the Son of God, who was crucified for us, than that by subtle questions and hair-splitting expressions he should fall into impiety."³⁾

Tertullian († 220? 240?) regarded the philosophers as the "patriarchs of all heresy." Quoting Col. 2, 8, he continues: "What indeed has Athens to do with Jerusalem? What concord is there between the Academy and the Church? what between heretics and Christians? Our instruction comes from the 'Porch of Solomon,' who was himself taught that 'the Lord should be sought in simplicity of heart.' Away with all attempts to produce a mottled Christianity of Stoic, Platonic, and dialectic composition! We want no curious disputation after possessing Christ Jesus, no inquisition after enjoying the Gospel! With our faith we desire no further belief. For this is our palmary faith that there is nothing which we ought to believe besides."⁴⁾ Again he says: "No man gets instruction from that which tends to destruction. No man receives illumination from a

3) *Adv. Haer.*, II, 26, 1.

4) *De Praescriptione Haereticorum*, 7.

quarter where all is darkness. Let our 'seeking' therefore be in that which is our own and from those who are our own and concerning that which is our own. That, only that, can become an object of inquiry without impairing the rule of faith." ⁵⁾ Again: "The Son of God was crucified; I am not ashamed because men must needs be ashamed of it. And the Son of God dies; it is by all means to be believed because it is absurd (*ineptum*). And He was buried and rose again; the fact is certain because it is impossible." ⁶⁾ In the last-quoted Statement Tertullian goes too far. The death and resurrection of Christ are to be believed, and that fact is certain not "because" it is absurd and impossible, but "even though" it may seem absurd and impossible to human reason.

When Augustine had read Cicero's *Hortensius*, he was filled with a burning desire to know the truth. First he joined the Manicheans, who promised a rational religion; but among them he found only irrationalities. In his growing despair of ever finding the truth he was inclined to surrender to the Academicians, who contended that man could not be certain of any truth; for man lacked every criterion of truth. But Augustine was shocked by such crass skepticism. "I was not so insane as to fancy that not even this [seven and three are ten] could be comprehended." ⁷⁾ Augustine did not doubt that seven and three are ten, but he would not accept anything else as true which he could not demonstrate in the same manner.

Before Augustine accepted the Christian faith and was baptized, he came under the influence of Neo-Platonism, and under this influence he developed his cognition theory. He held that knowledge is obtained not only through the senses, but also by intuition, by looking within oneself. "Be unwilling to go without, in thyself return; truth lives in the inner man." ⁸⁾ Looking within himself, man finds that truth which is a reflection of the eternal truth; for even as the light of the sun causes our eyes to be able to see certain things, so God causes intellectual realities to become clear to our intelligence. Augustine rejected the Platonic teaching that the human soul acquired its knowledge through a recollection of ideas beheld in a pre-existent state. He held that knowledge is attained through illumination from the divine Light. It is God, "the intelligible Light, in whom and from whom and through whom all things intelligibly shine which anywhere intelligibly shine." ⁹⁾ Again he writes: "Now listen, so far as the present time requires, while from that similitude of sensible things I now teach also something concerning God. Namely, God is intelligible, not sensible; intelligible also are those demonstrations of the schools; nevertheless they differ very widely. For as the earth is

5) *De Praescr. Haer.*, 12.

6) *De Carne Christi*, 5.

7) *Conf. VI*, 4, 6.

8) *De Vera Rel.*, 72.

9) *Solil.*, I, 3.

visible, so is light; but the earth, unless illuminated by light, cannot be seen. Therefore those things also which are taught in the schools, which no one who understands them doubts in the least to be absolutely true, we must believe to be incapable of being understood unless they are illuminated by somewhat else, as it were, a sun of their own. Therefore, as in this visible sun we may observe three things: that it is, that it shines, that it illuminates, so in that God, most far withdrawn, whom thou wouldst fain apprehend, there are three things: that He is, that He is apprehended, and that He makes other things to be apprehended."¹⁰ Truth, then, is to be found in man. If God illuminates the soul, it can apprehend that truth. This illumination theory Augustine had learned in the school of Neoplatonism.

The truth which Augustine would seek is the knowledge of God and of himself. "What wouldst thou know? All these things which I have prayed for. Sum them up in brief. God and the soul, that is what I desire to know. Nothing more? Nothing whatever."¹¹ But God has willed "that not any but the pure shall know the truth,"¹² and therefore no one can find God "unless he has been made pure."¹³ "The soul must be purified that it may have power to perceive the light and to rest in it when it is perceived."¹⁴ This is another Neoplatonic factor, that only the pure can apprehend the truth. — But how could Augustine reconcile this thought with Christianity, according to which man in his present condition is sinful? Here the necessity of revelation is introduced. Man, being sinful, is in need of a divine aid, and this divine aid is found in revelation. "Since we are too weak to search out the truth by mere reason and therefore need the authority of Holy Scripture, I began to believe God would never have given such surpassing authority to those Scriptures throughout the whole world except that He wished to be believed through them and to be sought by their means."¹⁵

Those, then, who "are weak should be encouraged to the utmost to enter the citadel of authority in order that, when they have been safely placed there, the conflict necessary for their defense may be maintained with the most strenuous use of reason."¹⁶ Augustine did not regard faith and reason as contradictory, but always as cooperating towards a common end, the attainment of truth. "No one doubts that we are impelled to the acquisition of knowledge by a double impulse, of authority and of reason."¹⁷ Faith is not to be credulity. "No one believes anything unless he has before thought it worthy of belief."¹⁸ Reason is therefore never "wholly lacking faith, because

10) *Op. cit.*, I, 15.

11) *Op. cit.*, I, 7.

12) *Op. cit.*, I, 2.

13) *Op. cit.*, I, 3.

14) *De Doctrina Chr.*, I, 10, 10.

15) *Conf. VI*, 4, 8.

16) *Ep. 118*, V, 32.

17) *Contra Acad.*, III, 20, 43.

18) *De Praed. Sanct.*, II, 5.

it belongs to it to consider to whom faith should be given." ¹⁹⁾ In spite of the fact that Augustine continually spoke of the authority of Scripture, he was nevertheless inclined to rationalism.

God, condescending to our weakness, has given to man His revelation, and being given by Him, it is sufficient authority upon which our faith may securely rest, even though we may not be able to comprehend it fully with our reason. Faith therefore precedes reason and prepares the way for reason. "We ought to believe before we understand." ²⁰⁾ "A certain faith is in some way the starting-point of our knowledge." ²¹⁾ "The light shines in darkness, and if the darkness comprehended it not, let them [those who are in darkness] first be illuminated by the gift of God that they may be believers; and let them begin to be light in comparison with unbelievers; and when this foundation has been laid, let them look up and see what they believe that at some time they may be able to see." ²²⁾ Here we have the germ of the later medieval speculation. First believe on the authority of Scripture and then seek to understand and apprehend that which is believed.

For Augustine the Scriptures are "established upon the supreme and heavenly pinnacle of authority" and should be read "without questioning the trustworthiness of its statements." ²³⁾ "To these canonical Scriptures alone I am bound to yield such implicit subjection as to follow their teaching without admitting the slightest suspicion that in them any mistake or any misstatement to mislead could find a place." ²⁴⁾ Augustine would "owe unhesitating assent to nothing but the canonical Scriptures"; ²⁵⁾ for from whatever has been written in other books "a man is at liberty to withhold his belief unless there is some clear demonstration or some canonical authority to show that the doctrine or statement either must or may be true. But in consequence of the distinctive peculiarity of the sacred writings we are bound to accept as true whatever the canon shows to have been said by even one prophet or apostle or evangelist." ²⁶⁾ Augustine protests against a subjective dealing with the Scriptures, which "makes every man's mind the judge of what in each scripture he is to approve or disapprove." This, he says, "is not to be subject to Scripture in matters of faith, but to make Scripture subject to you. Instead of making the high authority of Scripture the reason of approval, every man makes his approval the reason for thinking a passage is correct." ²⁷⁾ Augustine's principle regarding the authority of the Scriptures was correct, but in practise he himself was not

19) *De Vera. Rel.*, 24, 45.

20) *De Trin.*, VIII, 5, 8.

21) *Op. cit.*, IX, 1, 1.

22) *Op. cit.*, XV, 27, 49.

23) *Ep.* 82, II, 5.

24) *Ep.* 82, III, 24.

25) *De Nat. et Grat.*, LXI, 71.

26) *Contra Faust. Man.*, XI, 5.

27) *Op. cit.*, XXXII, 19.

always true to this principle. Thus, for example, after giving various interpretations of 1 Tim. 2, 4, he finally writes: "We may interpret it in any other way we please, so long as we are not compelled to believe that the omnipotent God has willed anything to be done which was not done."²⁸⁾

The supreme authority which Augustine thus accords to the Scriptures is due to their apostolicity. "The truth of the divine Scriptures has been received into the canonical summit of authority for this reason, that they are commended for the building up of our faith, not by anybody you please, but by the apostles themselves."²⁹⁾ "What Scripture can ever possess weight of authority if the gospels, if the apostolic Scriptures, do not possess it? Of what book can it ever be certain whose it is if it be uncertain whether those Scriptures are the apostles' which are declared and held to be the writings of the apostles by the Church propagated from those very apostles and manifested with so great conspicuousness through all nations?"³⁰⁾ The chief witness of the apostolicity of the Scriptures is therefore the Church. Hence Augustine says: "I indeed would not believe the Gospel except the authority of the Catholic Church moved me."³¹⁾

When Augustine closed his eyes in death (430 A.D.), the barbarian and pagan Germans were invading the Roman Empire and gradually destroyed not only the imperial power of Rome, but also the ancient Roman civilization. When their work of destruction was completed, dark night settled over Western Europe. The great mass of the laity, including the nobility, could neither read nor write; for learning was confined to the clergy and to the monks, who, though they did not produce anything new of themselves, deserve the everlasting gratitude of posterity for having preserved the inheritance of the past.

It was during the pontificate of Gregory the Great († 604) that Rome began to send the monks, her missionaries, far and wide to what is now known as England, France, and Germany, so that by the end of the eighth century most of Western Europe (all but Scandinavia) had become nominally Christian. Gregory, though he commended the study of the liberal arts as useful and necessary for the proper understanding of the Scriptures, delighted in the miraculous and made the fear of hell and not the love of God the dominant element of his theology. Imbued with this Gregorian theology, the monks threatened their hearers with the punishment of hell and purgatory and told them that salvation was to be found only within the Catholic Church; for only those who had been baptized and whose guilt had been removed through the instrumentality of the

28) *Ench.*, 103.

29) *Ep.* 82, II, 7.

30) *Contra Faust. Man.*, XXXIII, 6.

31) *Contra Ep. Man. Fund.*, V, 7.

Church, could ever hope to attain salvation. The newly converted heathens did not ask for reasons. They simply accepted the Christian faith on the authority of the Church, which was backed by the many astounding "miracles" of that day.

The typical works of the seventh, eighth, and ninth centuries are the *commentaries* on the Scriptures, consisting mainly of excerpts from the Church Fathers, especially from Augustine and Gregory. From the seventh century we have the three books of *Sentences* by Isidore of Seville († 636), a compendium of theology drawn mainly from the writings of Augustine and Gregory. These books remained the text-book of theology for five centuries until the time of Peter Lombard. *Commentaries* worthy of mention are those by the Venerable Bede († 804), Alcuin († 804), Rabanus Maurus († 856), and Walafrid Strabo († 849). The method employed in these commentaries is vividly described by Alcuin in a prefatory epistle to his *Commentary on the Gospel of John*. "Devoutly searching the pantries of the Holy Fathers, I let you taste whatever I have been able to find in them. Nor did I deem it fitting to cull the blossoms from any meadows of my own, but with a humble heart and head bowed low to search through the flowering fields of many Fathers and thus safely satisfy your pious pleasure. First of all I seek the suffrage of St. Augustine, who labored with such zeal upon this gospel; then I draw something from the tracts of the most holy Doctor St. Ambrose; nor have I neglected the homilies of Father Gregory, the Pope, or those of the blessed Bede, nor in fact, the works of others of the holy Fathers. I have cited their interpretations as I found them, preferring to use their meanings and their words to trusting to my own presumption."

Augustine had recognized dialectics as a proper tool of theology. This tool was not altogether lost, for some of the logical writings of Aristotle were translated and commented on by Boethius († 525), and these works of Boethius remained the text-book of the logical discipline until the twelfth century.

Dialectics seems to have flourished under the Venerable Bede and in the Palace School of Charlemagne under Alcuin, and from there it was introduced into the various cloister and cathedral schools then in existence. From a friend of Alcuin we have a treatise discussing first by "reason" and then by "authority" the question "whether or not nothing is something positive." The greatest dialectician of his age was Scotus Erigena († 877). In his view true philosophy was identical with true religion, both having the same divine source. In case of collision between authority and reason he would give preference to reason; for "authority proceeds from true reason, but true reason never from authority. For all authority which is not approved by reason seems weak; but true reason, since

it is established in its own strength and is immutable need be strengthened by no authority." ³²⁾ Rabanus Maurus, the bitter persecutor of Gottschalk, says: "The philosophers, especially the Platonists, if perchance they have spoken truths accordant with our faith, are not to be shunned, but their truths should be appropriated as from unjust possessors." ³³⁾ Rabanus speaks of dialectics as the *disciplina disciplinarum* and says: "It teaches how to teach and how to learn. . . . The clergy ought to know this noble art and have its laws in common meditation, so that subtly they may discern the wiles of heretics and confute their poisoned saying with the conclusions of syllogism." ³⁴⁾ But as yet few dared to apply the principles and art of dialectics to theology. This was first done in the controversy on the Lord's Supper by Berengar († 1088), who, though he mainly relied on, and appealed to, the Church Fathers also argued from reason. His chief opponent, Lanfranc († 1049), declared in his book against Berengar: "Where it concerns a mystery of faith, rather hear holy authority than dialectic reason." ³⁵⁾ But because dialectic theology soon became popular, he was also compelled to use this "tool" in defense of the doctrine of the Church, and thus he prepared the way for Scholasticism.

Dialectic theology brought with it a period of rationalism; for the "dialectic professors" ridiculed the simple Christian faith and claimed that only that could be believed which could be proved by reason. The first apologete to meet these "dialectic professors" solely on the ground of reason was Anselm of Canterbury († 1109), pupil of Lanfranc and rightly called the father of Scholasticism. Anselm is best known as the author of *Cur Deus Homo?*, which was written in order "by argument alone to satisfy not only Jews, but pagans also." ³⁶⁾

According to Anselm the Christian faith is something fixed and certain. To seek by reason to sustain and strengthen the Christian faith is like trying to prop up Mount Olympus with pegs and ropes. "No Christian dare question whether it be true what the universal Church believes with the heart and confesses with the mouth, and he must unquestioningly hold fast to that faith. But loving it and living accordingly, let him in all humility seek to fathom its depths. If he can understand it, let him thank God; if not, . . . let him bow his head and worship." ³⁷⁾ A Christian should seek to fathom the depths of the Christian faith and thus advance from faith to knowledge. "As the right order demands that we first receive into ourselves, believing, the mysteries of Christianity before subjecting them to speculative examination, so it seems to me the part of negligence if

32) *De Div. Nat.*, I, 71.

36) *Cur Deus Homo?* II, 22.

33) *De Cler. Inst.*, III, 26.

37) *De Fide Trin.*, 2.

34) *Op. cit.*, III, 20.

35) Quoted in Hasse, *Anselm von Canterbury*, Vol. II, p. 28.

after having become confirmed in the faith, we do not endeavor to understand what we have believed."³⁸⁾

Anselm was not satisfied with merely searching the "pantries" of the Church Fathers, but would "try (although what should be enough has been said by the holy Fathers on the subject) to show forth to those who are seeking that which God may deign to disclose to me."³⁹⁾ Anselm desired to experience the happiness and joy of knowing and understanding what he believed. "Come now, manikin, flee thy occupations for a little and hide from the confusion of thy cares. . . . Now, O Lord, my God, teach my heart where and how to seek Thee, where and how to find Thee. . . . I make no attempt, Lord, to penetrate Thy depths, for my intellect has no such reach; but I desire to understand some measure of Thy truth, which my heart believes and loves. I do not seek to know in order that I may believe; but I believe that I may know. For I believe this also, that, unless I shall have believed, I shall not understand."⁴⁰⁾ The same thought is expressed through *Boso*. "But I do ask this . . . not with the purpose of confirming me in the faith, but that you may gladden me by the logical proof of its truth to my intellect."⁴¹⁾

But Anselm would not only experience the joy of understanding but also desired to give reason for his faith. "They inquire, not that they may through reason be led to faith, but that they may be edified by the insight of those who do believe, and that they may, as far as they can, be always ready to give an effectual answer to any one who asks for a reason of the faith that is in us."⁴²⁾ The same thought is expressed through *Boso*. "It is fair that, whilst we are seeking to investigate the ground of our faith, we should bring forward the objections of those who will on no account give their adhesion to that same faith without some reason for it. For although that same reason is sought by them because they do not, but by us because we do believe; yet what we all seek is one and the same thing; and should you say anything in your answers which sacred authority should seem to contradict, may I be allowed to bring it forward, so that you may explain that this opposition does not exist?"⁴³⁾

Anselm would employ reason for a twofold purpose: a) to fathom the depths of faith and thus advance from faith to knowledge, b) to give reason for his faith and thereby refute or convince the unbeliever. Reason is not to be employed to confirm the faith; for faith is founded on the authority of the Church. This tendency, which seeks to fathom and penetrate the Christian faith by reason and which seeks to prove that this Christian faith is reasonable, is the peculiar trait of Scholasticism and betrays its speculative and rationalistic

38) *Ep. II*, 71.

39) *Op. cit.*, I, 1.

40) *Proslogion*, I.

41) *Cur Deus Homo?* II, 15.

42) *Op. cit.*, I, 1.

43) *Op. cit.*, I, 2.

character. Both these tendencies are still combined in Anselm; but later they branched out into two different schools. In all this, however, reason is still the handmaiden of faith. When a conflict between faith and reason arises, the latter must give way. "For of this I am sure, that, if I say anything which Holy Scripture undoubtedly contradicts, it is false; nor will I hold to it when I am once aware thereof." ⁴⁴⁾

Harris ⁴⁵⁾ has well summed up these thoughts when he writes: "Faith is thus everywhere presupposed, and theology lays down the norms and limits of philosophical speculation. But within its restricted sphere, reason exercises an important threefold function, its business being to attain a rational understanding of the truths of the faith, to coordinate the various provinces of particular dogmas, and to solve the problems raised by the difficulties of the revelation and to defend it against the objections of those outside the Christian fold. This conception of Anselm is noteworthy because it forms a well-marked state in the development of the two branches of speculation. Philosophy is still inextricably bound up with theology, but reason has begun to assert its independent claims. Not only had it sought to establish a proof of a strictly philosophical nature for the existence of God in the celebrated ontological argument, but also to explore once more the hidden mysteries of the faith, the doctrine of the Trinity, the Incarnation, and so forth."

The theology from the days of Anselm to the Reformation is, as a rule, designated as Scholasticism. Scholasticism consists chiefly in dialectically working over the doctrines received from the Church Fathers. We may distinguish four different stages of intellectual history during the Middle Ages. First there is a digesting of the food taken from the "pantries" of the Church Fathers. This period is represented by the *Scriptural commentaries*. Then followed a more logical and methodical appropriation of their theology as we find it in the *Books of Sentences*. Following this we have the golden age of Scholasticism, which not only reexpressed the inherited doctrines, but added thereto with the help of Aristotle's dialectics, as exhibited by the *Summa Theologiae*. Finally there is a period of decline, in which all manner of useless questions were dialectically treated and which resulted in a reaction, placing authority above reason. In this period we have the *commentaries* on the *Sentences*.

The man who closely followed in the footsteps of Anselm in applying the art of dialectics to theology was the "great lover," Peter Abelard († 1142). Abelard opposed the "pseudodialecticians" of his day, who claimed that "not because God said anything is it believed, but because it has been proved to be so is it accepted." ⁴⁶⁾ But his

44) *Op. cit.*, I, 18.

45) Harris, *Duns Scotus*, Vol. I, 45.

46) *Introd. ad Theol.*, II, 3.

own rationalistic tendency is exposed in the words: "Now, it so happened that I applied myself first to lecturing on the fundamentals of our faith by the analogy of human reason and composed a certain tract of theology, of Unity and the Holy Trinity; for our scholars were asking for human and philosophical reason and demanded rather what could be understood than what could be stated, saying indeed that the utterances of words were superfluous which the intelligence did not follow, nor could anything be believed unless it had first been understood, and that it was ridiculous for any one to preach to others what neither he himself nor they whom he taught could comprehend with their intellect."⁴⁷) Aptly has Taylor remarked: "Here one has the plain reversal. We must first understand in order to believe. Doubtless the demands of Abelard's students to have the principles of the Christian faith explained that they might be understood and accepted rationally echoed the master's imperative intellectual need."⁴⁸)

Abelard is best known as the author of *Sic et Non*, in which he placed the contradictory assertions of the Church Fathers side by side. He declared that these contradictions might only be apparent or due to the evil designs of forgers or to the inaccuracy of the copyists. Only that which is contained in the Scriptures is without exception free from error; but the writings of the Church Fathers are to be read "not with the necessity of believing, but with the liberty of judging." The key to knowledge is inquiry. "Wherefore we decided to collect the diverse statements of the holy Fathers as they might occur to our memory, thus raising an issue from their apparent repugnancy, which might incite the young lecturers to search out the truth of the matter and render them sharper for the investigation; for the first key to wisdom is called interrogation, diligent and unceasing. . . . By doubting we are led to inquiry, and from inquiry we perceive the truth."⁴⁹)

The great opponent of Abelard was Bernard of Clairvaux († 1153). Bernard, though himself inclined to mysticism, was thoroughly opposed to all human speculation. "This is my philosophy, and it is the loftiest in the world: to know Jesus, and Him crucified."⁵⁰) He wrote to Pope Innocent III: "We have in France an old teacher turned into a new theologian, who in his early days amused himself with dialectics and now gives utterance to wild imaginations upon Holy Scripture. . . . I know not what there is in heaven above and in the earth beneath which he deigns to confess ignorance of; he raises his eyes to heaven and searches the deep things of God and then, returning to us, brings back unspeakable

47) *Hist. Cal.*, 9.

48) Taylor, *Medieval Mind* (3d Amer. ed.), Vol. I, 45.

49) *Prol.*, *Sic et Non*.

50) *In Cant. Serm.*, XLIII, 4.

words, which it is not lawful for a man to utter, while he presumptuously prepares to give reason for everything, even of those things which are above reason; he presumes against reason and against faith. For what is more against faith than to be unwilling to believe what reason cannot attain?" 51)

Abelard's method was employed by his pupil, the *Magister Sententiarum*, Peter Lombard († 1164), whose *Quatuor Libri Sententiarum* became the text-book of dogmatic study during the following ages. In this book we find a great number of citations from the Church Fathers. Questions are raised, authorities are cited for and against, and a conclusion is reached by a dialectic treatment. In the Catholic Church the authority of the Lombard is second only to that of the great Thomas Aquinas.

Up until the close of the twelfth century the Western world was acquainted with Aristotle only through the translation of Boethius. However, towards the first quarter of the thirteenth century nearly all the commentaries on all the works of Aristotle by the Arabian philosophers had been translated into Latin, and thus the whole of Aristotelian philosophy became better known to the Scholastics. A short time later Aristotle was translated directly from the Greek text.

The translation of Aristotle's *Metaphysics*, *Physics*, *Psychology*, and *Ethics* led to a renewed interest in the study of philosophy. At first Aristotle's books on natural philosophy were forbidden by the ecclesiastical authorities. In 1209 a provincial council held in Paris declared "neither the books of Aristotle on natural philosophy nor commentaries on the same should be read at Paris either publicly or secretly." But in 1255 the Faculty of Arts at the University of Paris officially placed all the works of Aristotle on the list of subjects to be studied, and in a short time Aristotle was universally regarded as the *praecursor Christi in naturalibus*.

The zenith of Scholasticism was reached in Alexander of Hales, his pupil Bonaventura, Albertus Magnus, and his pupil and later fellow-professor, the "Prince of Scholastics," Thomas Aquinas. The last two were Dominicans, the former a Franciscan. The order of the Franciscans (after Francis of Assisi, † 1245) and the order of Dominicans (after Dominic, † 1215) were founded in 1209 and 1215, respectively. Neither of the two orders was founded in order to promote learning, but both produced eminent scholars.

The founder of high-Scholasticism was Alexander of Hales († 1245), the author of the unfinished *Summa Universae Theologiae*, which Roger Bacon ridiculed as "being more than the weight of one horse." Alexander was the first to use the entire philosophy of Aristotle, and not only did he produce a commentary on the *Sen-*

51) *Tract. de Err. Abael.*, I, 1; cf. *Sermon on Cant.*, 36, 1. 2.

iences of Peter Lombard, but he added problem upon problem. The separate doctrines were subdivided more and more on the basis of Aristotelian dialectics.

According to Alexander the object of theological inquiry is the inherited faith of the Church as laid down in the Scriptures and in the symbols of the Church. Alexander distinguished between a *fides acquisita*, or *informata*, and a *fides formata*, the former being acquired by being convinced through authority or reason, the latter being infused through illumination by the grace of God, unaided by outward authority or reason. Man accepts the doctrine as true because of authority or reason (*fides acquisita*) and is thereby disposed for the inner certainty (*fides formata*), which compels the will to assent.

The same view was held by Bonaventura († 1274). Faith is the starting-point. But the mysteries of faith become perfectly intelligible only through the light of supernatural grace, which enables the mind to comprehend rationally what it believes. He writes in his *Prologus* to the *Breviloquium*: "The source lies not in human investigation, but in divine revelation, which flows from the Father of Lights, . . . from whom through His Son Jesus Christ, the Holy Spirit flows in us; and through the Holy Spirit, bestowing, as He wills, gifts on each, faith is given, and through faith Christ dwells in our hearts. This is the knowledge of Jesus Christ, from which, as from a source, comes the certitude and understanding of the whole Scriptures. Wherefore it is impossible that any one should advance in their knowledge unless he first has Christ infused in him." To the mind thus illuminated by the gift of faith it can be demonstrated that certain mysteries of revelation are necessary. Thus, for example, it can be shown that the number of persons in the Trinity must of necessity be three, "neither more nor less."⁵²

In Alexander and in Bonaventura we have the old Augustinian illumination theory, only worked out according to the Aristotelian categories. It remained the cognition theory of the Franciscans until Duns Scotus. In this view, reason is still regarded as the hand-maiden of faith and employed to make the mysteries of faith intelligible. However, in opposition to this speculative and idealistic Augustinian-Franciscan school there arose an intellectualistic and rationalistic Aristotelian-Dominican school in which faith and reason gradually separated.

Albertus Magnus († 1280) had with tireless energy and massive learning reproduced the whole Aristotelian philosophy and had removed to a great extent the Platonism and Neo-Platonism which it acquired in its transmission through the Arabian commentators. On this foundation Thomas Aquinas († 1274) built up a system which was the most perfect accommodation possible between ecclesiastical

⁵²) Sent. I, dist. II, art. I, q. 3.

orthodoxy and Aristotelian philosophy. Aquinas sought to reexpress the inherited faith of the Church in such a manner as to attain a purely intellectualistic and rationalistic knowledge of that faith.

The speculative trend attached to the former cognition theories completely disappeared in Thomas Aquinas. According to Augustine man finds in himself that truth which is a reflection of the eternal truth. As the light of the sun causes our eyes to be able to see certain things, so God causes intellectual verities to become known to our intelligence. This theory was rejected by Aquinas. He writes: "Wherefore some held that this intellect (the higher intellect, God), substantially separate, is the active intellect which, by lighting up the phantasms, as it were, makes them to be actually intelligible. But even supposing the existence of such a separate active intellect, it would still be necessary to assign to the human soul some power participating in that superior intellect, by which power the human soul makes things actually intelligible. . . . Wherefore we must say that in the soul is some power derived from a higher intellect whereby it is able to light up the phantasms. And we know this by experience, since we perceive that we abstract universal forms from the particular conditions, which is to make them actually intelligible. Now, no action belongs to anything except through some principle formally inherent therein. . . . Therefore the power which is the principle of this action must be something in the soul." 53) According to Aquinas the human soul itself has the innate power to abstract from the sense perceptions particular forms, which the active intellect transforms into intelligible species. "We must assign on the part of the intellect some power to make things actually intelligible by the abstraction of the species from material conditions." 54)

Following in the footsteps of Albertus Magnus, Aquinas distinguished between philosophy and theology, between "philosophical science" and "sacred doctrine." Of the two, theology is supreme, and it has the duty to judge all other sciences. "It has no concern to prove the principles of other sciences, but only to judge of them. Whatever in other sciences is found contrary to any truth of this science must be condemned as false." 55)

By reason man is able to learn some things about God, but the Trinity and some other Christian doctrines cannot be demonstrated by reason. "Certain things that are true about God wholly surpass the capability of human reason, for instance, that God is three and one, while there are certain things to which even natural reason can attain, for instance, that God is, that God is one, and others like these, which even the philosophers proved demonstratively of God, being guided by the light of natural reason. . . . Accordingly some

53) *Summa Theol.*, I, q. 79, a. 4.

55) *Op. cit.*, I, q. 1, a. 5.

54) *Summa Theol.*, I, q. 79, a. 3.

divine truths are attainable by human reason, while others altogether surpass the power of human reason." 56) But those divine truths which may be attained by human reason can be attained only after a most laborious study"; hence mankind would remain in the deepest darkness of ignorance if the path of reason were the only available way to the knowledge of God; for the knowledge of God which especially makes men perfect and good would be acquired only by the few, and by these only after a long time. . . . Accordingly the divine clemency has made this salutary commandment, that even some things which reason is able to investigate must be held by faith, so that all may share in the knowledge of God easily, and without doubt or error." 57) Divine revelation is therefore necessary "in order that the salvation of men might be brought about more fitly and surely." 58)

The highest authority is Scripture. Arguments based "on reason are the weakest." But theology also makes "use of the authority of philosophers in those questions in which they were able to know the truth by natural reason. . . . Sacred doctrine makes use of these authorities as extrinsic and probable arguments, but properly uses the authority of the canonical Scriptures as an incontrovertible proof and the authority of the doctors of the Church as one that may be properly used, yet merely as probable. For our faith rests upon the revelation made to the apostles and prophets, who wrote the canonical books, and not on the revelations (if any such there are) made to other doctors." 59)

The duty of theology is not to prove the articles of faith by reason. "This doctrine does not argue in proof of its principles, which are the articles of faith. . . . If our opponent believes nothing of divine revelation, there is no longer any means of proving the articles of faith by reasoning, but only by answering his objections — if he has any — against faith. Since faith rests upon infallible truth, and since the contrary of a truth can never be demonstrated, it is clear that the arguments brought against the faith cannot be demonstrated, but are difficulties that can be answered." 60)

Revelation is not contrary to reason. Even though the Christian faith surpasses the ability of human reason, "nevertheless those things which are naturally instilled into human reason cannot be opposed to this truth. . . . The knowledge of naturally known principles is instilled into us by God, since God Himself is the Author of our nature. Therefore the divine Wisdom also contains these principles. Consequently whatever is contrary to these principles is contrary to the divine Wisdom, wherefore it cannot be from God. Therefore those things which are received by faith from divine revelation cannot be

56) *Summa contra Gent.*, I, c. 3.

57) *Op. cit.*, I, c. 4.

58) *Summa Theol.*, I, q. 1, a. 1.

59) *Op. cit.*, I, q. 1, a. 8.

60) *Op. cit.*, I, q. 1, a. 8.

contrary to our natural knowledge." ⁶¹⁾ And this is the aim and object of the *Summa Theologiae*, namely, to prove "that those things which are represented in the faith are not impossible." ⁶²⁾ Aquinas, though he distinguished between theology and philosophy, would by the intricate method of dialectics show that the doctrine of the Church is reasonable, and thereby he again brought faith and reason under the same roof.

The great opponent of Thomas Aquinas was the Franciscan Duns Scotus († 1306), and after his time the theologians were divided into Thomists and Scotists. In Duns Scotus dialectics reached the point of highest development. "No man ever drove either constructive logic or the subtilities of critical distinctions closer to the limit of human comprehension or human patience than Duns Scotus. And here lies the trouble with him. The endless ramifications and refinements of his dialectics, his devious processes of conclusion, make his work a *reductio ad absurdum* of scholastic ways of reasoning. Logically, eristically, the argumentation is inerrant. It never wanders aimlessly, but, winding and circling, at last reaches a conclusion from some point unforeseen. Would you run a course with this master of syllogism? If you enter his lists, you are lost. The right way to attack him is to stand without and laugh. That is what was done afterwards, when whoever cared for such reasonings was called a dunce, after the name of the most subtle of medieval metaphysicians." ⁶³⁾

Even as Aquinas, so Duns Scotus rejected the older Augustinian illumination theory. "Scotus merely expresses more clearly what Thomas had conveyed in terms of Augustinian terminology. . . . The active intellect itself is the guarantor of our certitude." ⁶⁴⁾ Duns Scotus also distinguished between theology and philosophy. Theology is based on divine revelation, which is the only certain and binding authority. Arguments based on philosophical reasoning and on the statements of the doctors of the Church are only "probable." Reason is to prove that the articles of faith are not impossible.

Those truths which are necessary for our salvation are found in Scripture. "The sacred Scriptures sufficiently contain the doctrine necessary to the pilgrim." ⁶⁵⁾ Nevertheless the authority of the Roman Church is supreme. "Nothing is to be held as of the substance of the faith except that which can be expressly derived from Scripture or which is expressly declared by Scripture or plainly determined by the Church." ⁶⁶⁾ Duns Scotus severely criticized not only the contemporary theologians, but even Augustine and Aristotle.

61) *Summa contra Gent.*, I, c. 7.

65) *Sent.*, *Prolog.*, q. 2. 14.

62) *Summa Theol.*, II, II, q. 1, a. 5.

66) *Sent.*, IV, d. 6, q. 9. 14.

63) Taylor, *Medieval Mind* (3d Amer. ed.), Vol. II, p. 544.

64) Harris, *Duns Scotus*, Vol. I, p. 198.

He would bow only before the authority of the Church. To cite but one example. Since the days of the Lombard it had been held that through Baptism a sacramental character is imprinted on the recipient. Duns severely criticized the very idea of a sacramental character; for neither reason nor authority demand it and only a passage from Pope Innocent III can be cited in its favor. And yet the teaching of the Church must be upheld. "One must believe regarding the Sacraments of the Church as the Romish Church believes. But the Romish Church seems to believe that in Baptism a character is impressed upon the soul." He then cites the passage from Innocent and continues: "Therefore, because of the sole authority of the Church, as much as is concerned for the present, we must hold that a character is impressed."⁶⁶ We have here that churchly positivism so prevalent in later Scholasticism.

Aquinas had held that the Trinity could not be demonstrated by reason. To this Duns Scotus added that it was also true of divine omnipotence and the immortality of the soul. Thereby he separated faith and reason more and more, and this finally gave the death-blow to Scholasticism.

In 1346 Pope Clement VI wrote reprovingly to the University of Paris: "Most theologians do not trouble themselves about the text of Holy Scripture, about the actual words of their principal witnesses, about the expositions of the saints and doctors, *i. e.*, concerning the sources from which real theology is taken, a fact which is bitterly to be deplored. . . . In place of this they entangle themselves in philosophical questions and in disputes, which merely pander to their cleverness in doubtful interpretations, dangerous doctrines, and the rest."⁶⁷ Truly a sad state of affairs!

In Duns Scotus reason and faith, philosophy and theology, threatened to part company. The breach was made final by the so-called Nominalists. Following in the footsteps of Scotus in criticizing unsparingly all traditional belief, we find the Franciscan William of Ockham (†1347) and the last of the Scholastics, Gabriel Biel (†1495). According to Ockham cognition is only through "intuitive knowledge"; *i. e.*, by experience man learns whether a thing is so or not. Ockham therefore held that no theological doctrine could be demonstrated by reason and that all must be relegated to the sphere of faith. Thereby the breach made by Duns Scotus in the old scholastic unity of theology and philosophy was made irreparable. The province of both lies in a different sphere. Sorley says that at the time of Ockham "the separation between theology and philosophy, faith and reason, was made complete. Ockham admitted that there are probably arguments for the existence of God, but maintained the

67) Quoted in Grisar, *Martin Luther* (Lamond transl.), Vol. I, p. 134.

final thesis that whatever transcends experience belongs to faith. In this way he broke with Scotism as well as with Thomism on a fundamental question." 68)

However, Ockham was not willing to surrender the traditional doctrine, even though it was based on faith and not on reason. "This is also my faith, since this is the Catholic faith. For whatever the Roman Church explicitly believes, this alone and nothing else, either explicitly or implicitly, I believe." 69) Catholic are only those doctrines which are based on Scripture. "Therefore the Christian is not by the necessity of salvation to believe, nor is he to believe what is neither contained in the Bible nor can be inferred by necessary and manifest consequence alone from things contained in the Bible." 70) But though Ockham and his followers theoretically upheld *sola Scriptura*, they did not carry out this principle in practise. Ockham would not accept the traditional doctrine of original sin "if there were not the authority of the saints." 71) Again he writes: "Although it is expressly set forth in the canonical Scriptures that the body of Christ is to be offered to the faithful under the species of bread, yet that the substance of the bread is really converted or transubstantiated into the body of Christ is not found expressed in the canon of the Bible; but this doctrine is believed to have been divinely revealed to the holy Fathers or to have been proved from passages of the Bible by a diligent and skilful examination; and therefore I shall cite passages of the holy Fathers to prove this truth." 72) In a controversy the word of the Roman Pontiff is supreme. "It is therefore obvious that, when there may be a controversy among theologians as to whether it may agree or disagree with the Christian faith, it must be referred to the Supreme Pontiff." 73) Ockham's sword was sharp and keen in the conflict with his opponents, but it was blunted as soon as it met the authority of the Church. "Although I shall say nothing assertatively except that which the Roman Church teaches, I am prepared in all things to hold in check my inclination by virtue of the authority of the same Church and also to believe with the heart and to confess with the lips the universal truths which the Roman Church expounds or will expound." 74) "I am unwilling by virtue of the dictum of any one of the plebs to hold in check my intellect and to affirm something contrary to a dictate of reason, unless the Roman Church may teach this view must be held; for the authority of the Roman Church is greater than the whole capacity of human genus." 75)

It is indeed surprising that these men who applied reason so

68) Quoted in Birch's ed. of Ockham, *De Sacra. Alt.*, p. XXVI.

69) *Op. cit.*, c. 1.

70) *Dial.*, p. 411.

71) *Sent.*, II, d. 26, U.

72) *De Sacra. Alt.*, c. III.

73) *Op. cit.*, c. XXXVI.

74) *Op. cit.*, c. 16.

75) *Op. cit.*, c. 36.

sharply against the traditional doctrine of the Church were yet at all times willing to submit themselves to the authority of the Church. How had the mighty fallen! Scholasticism, which sought to prove that Christianity was reasonable, ended with the dictum, "I believe as the Church believes."⁷⁶⁾ Then came Luther to lead men back from scholastic speculation and rationalism, back from the authority of the Church, to faith founded solely on the revelation of God.

Morrison, III.

THEO. DIERKS.

Dispositionen über die erste von der Synodalkonferenz angenommene Evangelienreihe.

Einundzwanzigster Sonntag nach Trinitatis.

Mark. 10, 46—52.

Jesus befand sich auf seiner letzten Reise nach Jerusalem, Mark. 10, 32; 11, 1. Bei seinem Durchzug durch Jericho fanden die Blindenheilungen statt. Die Berichte der drei Evangelisten bringen nicht alle dieselben Einzelheiten; jedoch haben wir es nicht mit einem Widerspruch zu tun. (Stöckhardt, Bibl. Gesch. d. N. T., S. 230.) Markus berichtet über die Heilung des blinden Bartimäus. Eine wichtige Rolle bei dieser Heilung spielte das Wort:

„Sei getrost, stehe auf! Er ruft dir.“

1. Dieses Wort erweckte Hoffnung.
2. Dieses Wort führte zur Heilung.
3. Dieses Wort erweckte Nachfolge Jesu.

1.

Der blinde Bartimäus saß in seinem Elend am Wege und bettelte. Er hatte vernommen, daß viel Volks vorüberging, Luk. 18, 36, und sich wohl erkundigt, was das zu bedeuten habe. Er meinte wohl, daß eine solch große Menge ihn mit manch einer freundlichen Gabe bedenken würde. Die Auskunft, daß Jesus vorübergehe, erweckte in ihm solche Hoffnung, daß er laut schrie: „Jesus, du Sohn Davids, erbarm dich mein!“ Jetzt war der große Augenblick seines Lebens gekommen. Bisher war sein Elend derart gewesen, daß weder er selbst noch andere ihn davon befreien konnten. Niemand konnte ihn von der Blindheit heilen. Er durfte auch keinen Anspruch auf Heilung machen. Er hatte so etwas nicht verdient. Selbst jetzt mußte Hilfe aus Erbarmen kommen, B. 47.

Genau so steht es mit allen Menschen von Natur. Sie liegen in geistlicher Blindheit, 1 Kor. 2, 14. Sie können Jesum nicht als ihren Heiland „sehen“, ja überhaupt nichts vom Geist Gottes vernehmen. Weder der Mensch selbst noch andere Menschen vermögen ihn von dieser

⁷⁶⁾ Biel, *Expos. Can. Miss. Lect.*, 12 B.

Blindheit zu heilen. So etwas hat auch kein Mensch verdient. Nur die Barmherzigkeit Gottes kann da helfen.

Wie schrecklich muß es den armen Bartimäus berührt haben, als das Volk ihn bedrohte, er solle schweigen! V. 48. Gerade die Leute, die ihm hätten helfen und ihn hätten zu Jesu führen sollen, haben versucht, ihn zum Schweigen zu bringen. — So ergeht es auch den geistlich Blinden. Wenn der arme Sünder in seinem Elend um Hilfe schreit, dann will die Welt sicherlich nichts davon hören, daß er zu Jesu gebracht werde. Sie achtet so etwas für reine Torheit. 1 Kor. 1, 18. 23; 2, 14; 2 Kor. 4, 3. 4.

Sobald aber Jesus stille stand und Bartimäus rufen ließ, war des Letzteren Hoffnung unbeschreiblich groß. Sein ganzes Verhalten beweist dies, V. 50. — So kann auch nur durch Jesu Wort in den geistlich Blinden rechte Hoffnung erweckt werden.

2.

Jesu Erbarmen, Stillstehen und Ruf bewog das Volk, dem Blinden zuzurufen: „Sei getrost, siehe auf! Er rufet dir.“ Jetzt war die Menge bereit, dem armen Blinden zu dienen. Diesen brauchte man nicht lange zu rufen. Er „stund auf und kam“ (oder „sprang auf“). Die langen Kleider, die ihn am schnellen Gehen hinderten, warf er von sich, V. 50. Man hat ihn wohl eilends zu Jesu geführt. Nun war er bei dem, der ihm helfen konnte. Jesus gab ihm auch Gelegenheit, sein Anliegen ihm kundzutun. Welch ein Augenblick im Leben des Bartimäus! Jetzt war er bei seinem Helfer; jetzt durfte er bitten; jetzt stand ihm gewisse Heilung bevor. Wie vertrauensvoll und mit welch kindlichen Worten beantwortete er Jesu Frage: „Rabbuni, daß ich sehend werde!“

Auf diese Bitte folgte alsbald die Heilung. Jesus sagte: „Gehe hin; dein Glaube hat dir geholfen.“ Welch ein Wunder! Der Blinde konnte jetzt sehen.

„Sei getrost, siehe auf! Er rufet dir“, dieses Wort im süßen Evangelium hat dieselbe Wirkung in der Heilung der geistlich Blinden. Der Ruf Jesu ist ein kräftiger, göttlicher Ruf, 2 Tim. 1, 9; 1 Petr. 2, 9. Das Evangelium ist eine Gotteskraft, Röm. 1, 16. Jesu Worte sind „Geist und Leben“. Wenn Jesus ruft, dann fallen die Schuppen von den Augen; dann ist die Heilung vollzogen; dann kann man Jesum als Heiland „sehen“.

3.

„Und folgte ihm nach auf dem Wege“, wird von Bartimäus berichtet. Er war so dankbar für die erfahrene Hilfe, daß er nun nicht anders konnte als Jesu nachfolgen und ihm dienen.

Die Nachfolge Jesu wird bei keiner Heilung von geistlicher Blindheit ausbleiben. Wer Jesum als Heiland „sieht“, wird ihn auch als Vorbild oder Exempel des Lebens „sehen“ wollen. Auf solch unbediente Hilfe folgt Dankbarkeit, die sich in herzlicher Nachfolge und treuem Dienst erweisen wird. Ein solcher, dem Jesus die Augen geöffnet hat,

erkennt auch, daß nur Jesus der „Vollender des Glaubens“ sein kann; darum will er bei ihm bleiben. Ein solcher erkennt Jesus als den treuen Heiland, der den Glauben stärkt, der in der Not uns beisteht und uns tröstet, der zum Christenleben Kraft und Vermögen verleiht usw. Ein solcher kann gar nicht anders als Jesus nachfolgen und ihm dienen.

Zum Schluß kann man noch darauf hinweisen, daß solche, die der Heiland „sehend“ gemacht hat, nun auch andern die frohe Botschaft bringen werden: „Sei getrost, stehe auf! Er ruft dir.“

J. W. B e h n e n.

Zweihundzwanzigster Sonntag nach Trinitatis.

Luk. 14, 25—35.

„Es kostet viel, ein Christ zu sein.“ So sang einst der Liederdichter Richter. Sonderbar? Den Herrn Jesus hat es allerdings sein Leben gekostet, uns die Seligkeit zu erwerben; nun aber wird sie uns aus Gnaden geschenkt. Und doch bleibt es wahr: „Es kostet viel, ein Christ zu sein Und nach dem Sinn des reinen Geistes leben.“ Es stimmt das ganz und gar mit den Worten Jesu in unserm Text: „So jemand zu mir kommt und hasset nicht seinen Vater, Mutter“ usw., 9. 26. 27. 33. Es ist hier eben nicht die Rede von der Erwerbung der Seligkeit, noch davon, wie man ein Christ wird, sondern davon, daß in unserer Nachfolge Jesu wir das Schwere dabei ins Auge fassen und auf uns nehmen müssen: wir müssen manches drangeben, manches erleiden und dulden. — Auch davon, wie wir das leisten können, nämlich in Gottes Kraft und Gnade, ist hier nicht die Rede, sondern nur von der Tatsache selbst, was nämlich zur wahren Jüngerschaft Jesu gehört. Ja, „es kostet viel, ein Christ zu sein“, oder, wie Jesus das alles in diese Worte zusammenfaßt, die wir jetzt unserer Predigt voranstellen:

„Wer nicht abgibt allem, was er hat, kann nicht mein Jünger sein.“

Betrachten wir,

1. was zu diesen Worten Jesu den Anlaß gab;
2. wie sie zu verstehen sind.

1.

a. Das Erscheinen Jesu in der Öffentlichkeit verursachte öfters großes Aufsehen und das Zusammenkommen einer großen Menschenmenge, Matth. 4, 25; 13, 2; Joh. 8, 2; 6, 2. 24; 12, 12—19 („alle Welt läuft ihm nach“).

b. Jesus hatte viele Nachläufer, aber wenige Nachfolger. Den meisten war Jesus nur ein großer Wundermann und ein guter Brotherr (siehe, die eben angeführten Schriftstellen in ihrem Zusammenhang an); aber von ihm als Heiland wollten sie nichts wissen und waren nicht bereit, die Kosten der Nachfolge Jesu auf sich zu nehmen. Auf das

„Gosianna“ folgte bald das „Kreuzige ihn!“ Das veranlaßte Iſſum bei der Gelegenheit, auf die unser Text hinweist, als auch viel Volks ihm nachlief, v. 25, darauf aufmerksam zu machen, daß, wer ein Chriſt sein will, wohl die Kosten überschlagen sollte, v. 28.

Dieselben Erfahrungen macht der Heiland, und wir mit ihm, auch heute. Groß ist die Zahl derer, die sich Chriſten nennen; aber viele unter ihnen befinden sich nicht einmal im chriſtlichen Lager (Modernisten, Christian Scientists und dergleichen mehr), und viele innerhalb der äußeren Chriſtenheit, auch in unsern Gemeinden, sind nur Chriſten dem Namen nach, die von der Selbſtverleugnung in der Nachfolge Chriſti nichts wissen wollen. Ihr „Chriſtentum“ ist ein rein äußerliches Ding. Gegen solche richtet sich Iſſus in unserm Text.

2.

a. Die Schrift sagt, daß man Vater und Mutter, Weib und Kind lieben soll, z. B. Eph. 5, 28. 33; und hier sagt der Heiland, man solle sie haßen. Die Schrift sagt, ein Chriſt dürfe Hab und Gut haben und gebrauchen, z. B. Matth. 6, 33, das ſiebte Gebot, das uns das Eigentum beſchützt, die vierte Bitte; und hier sagt Iſſus, der Chriſt müſſe allem, was er habe, abſagen. Das ſind einander ſcheinbar widerſprechende Ausſagen; aber auch nur ſcheinbar.

b. Der rechte Verſtand der Worte Iſſu, v. 26. 33, iſt dieſer: Was zwiſchen Iſſum, den Heiland, und einen Chriſten tritt, ſich alſo mit der Nachfolge Iſſu nicht verträgt, dem muß ein Chriſt abſagen, das muß er um Iſſu willen haßen, ja ſelbſt Vater, Mutter uſw., wenn dieſe ihn an der Nachfolge Iſſu hindern wollen. Man muß Gott mehr geborchen denn den Menſchen, Apoſt. 5, 29, und Iſſum mehr lieben als Vater und Mutter, Sohn und Tochter, Matth. 10, 32—39. (Man könnte dieſen Abſchnitt wohl als Schriftlektion verſeſen.)

Die rechte Nachfolge Iſſu erfordert, daß man ihm das Kreuz nachträgt, v. 27. Unter dem Kreuz ſind nicht zunächſt natürliche Leiden zu verſtehen, wie Krankheit, Verluſt durch Tod, Feuersbrunſt uſw., die die Frommen mit den Gottloſen gemein haben, obwohl Chriſten in Geduld ſolche Leiden tragen; und gewißlich ſind mit dem Kreuz nicht ſelbſtgemachte Leiden gemeint, Pf. 32, 10; ſondern ſolche Leiden, die man um Chriſti willen auf ſich nimmt, die man als Chriſt erdulden muß, z. B. Verachtung und Spott der Welt, Verluſt der Freuſchaft ſolcher, die im Chriſtentum nicht mitmachen wollen uſw. Wer ſo Iſſu das Kreuz nachträgt, dem iſt das ein Kennzeichen ſeines Gnadenſtandes und eine rechte Ehre, Apoſt. 5, 40. 41.

Zwei Gleichniſſe führt der Herr an, um das Geſagte zu erläutern, v. 28—32. Wenn man ſchon in rein irdiſchen, aber großen und wichtigen Werken die damit verbundenen Schwierigkeiten nicht überſieht, ſo ſoll man das erſt recht nicht tun bei einer ſo wichtigen Sache wie der Nachfolge Iſſu. Man überſchlage die Kosten: der Welt rein ab und

Christo an. Christen sollen sich als ein Salz hier auf Erden be-
währen, B. 34. 35; Matth. 5, 13.

Aus eigener Kraft können wir nicht leisten, was in der Nachfolge
Jesu von uns verlangt wird, wohl aber in Gottes Kraft. Verlassen wir
uns deshalb allein auf Gottes Gnade in Christo! Mit Christo werden
auch wir den Sieg davontragen; ja, in Christo haben wir schon gesiegt,
1 Cor. 15, 57; 1 Petr. 1, 5. So konnte denn auch derselbe Diederichster,
der in einem Lied singt: „Es kostet viel, ein Christ zu sein“, in einem
andern Liede singen:

Es ist nicht schwer, ein Christ zu sein
Und nach dem Sinn des reinen Geistes leben;
Denn der Natur geht es zwar sauer ein,
Sich immerdar in Christi Tod zu geben,
Doch führt die Gnade selbst zu aller Zeit
Den schweren Streit.

(Württembergisches Gesangbuch, Nr. 386. 387.)

J. S. C. Friß.

Dreißundzwanzigster Sonntag nach Trinitatis.

Matth. 17, 24—27.

Nach fleißigem Nachforschen kommt man zu der Überzeugung, daß
der im Text gesammelte Beitrag nicht bürgerliche Steuer war, auch nicht
der gebotene Zehnte, sondern eine besondere Kollekte, eine von ernst-
gesinnten Juden freiwillig dargereichte Gabe für den Tempelfonds.
S. 2 Kön. 12, 4 ff.; 22, 1 ff.; 2 Chron. 24, 6; Neh. 10, 32. Immer
haben ernste Kinder Gottes Opfer dargebracht zur Ehre und zum Dienste
Gottes. „Zur Stiftshütte des Herrn bringt ein jeder nach seinem Ver-
mögen: einen Gold, Silber, Edelsteine, der andere Häute und Ziegen-
haare.“ (Hieronymus; zitiert von Luther, I, 3.) — Die Gewohnheit zu
opfern ist nicht neu, sondern von Anfang der Welt gewesen. (Luther, I,
302.) Aber noch heute regt sich der Geiz; man entzieht dem Reich
Gottes seine Beiträge oder gibt nur geringe Summen und heuchelt dabei
Gottesdienst trotz der neutestamentlichen Ordnung. Zu 1 Kor. 16, 1 ff.
und zu reichlicher Beteiligung auch an besonderen Kollekten werden wir
durch unsern Text ermuntert.

Unser Kirchenbeitrag.

1. Er wird uns von Jesu, dem allmächtigen Gott
und Heiland, gegeben und von ihm geheiligt.
2. Er wird von den wahren Christen auch treulich
entrichtet.

1.

Als Jesus vor Petrus die Strahlen seiner Allwissenheit leuchten
ließ durch sein „Zuborkommen“, B. 25, und durch seine Ankündigung
des merkwürdigen Fischeffangs, B. 27, mußte dieser immer wieder be-
kennen: Dieser Mensch ist Gott. Gleichfalls bei der Erfassung der All-

macht Christi, der allein der wunderbare Fischfang zuzuschreiben war. Jesus ist der allmächtige Gott. Er regiert alle Dinge und verfügt über sie, wie er will. Hier schafft er den Beitrag zur Tempelsteuer selbst herbei. Er gibt auch uns unsern Kirchenbeitrag; sonst hätten wir nichts, ihm zu geben, 1 Kor. 4, 7; Röm. 11, 35. 36. Er gibt uns den Beitrag zuvor wie dem Petrus, manchmal auf dem Wege der täglichen Arbeit, manchmal auf andere, wunderbare Weise.

Jesus ist der Heiland. Als er hier auf Erden wandelte, erniedrigte er sich so tief, daß er nicht einmal Geld hatte, um seinen Beitrag für das Haus Gottes zu entrichten (der bei manchen Christen allerdings das erste, bei vielen andern aber leider das letzte ist, worum sie sich kümmern). 2 Kor. 8, 9. Als der Sohn Gottes brauchte er keinen Beitrag zu entrichten. Er war frei, R. 25. Aber er opferte doch, R. 27: für sich selbst und für Petrus, und um Ärgernis zu verhüten. Also war auch diese Tat Christi stellvertretend, und auch damit hat er das Gesetz für uns erfüllt. Als unser Heiland hat er durch die Entrichtung seines Beitrags sowohl unsern Beitrag selbst als auch die Entrichtung desselben, die doch, wie alle unsere guten Werke, mit allerlei Sünden besetzt sind, geheiligt. Unsere Opfer sind Gott angenehm und annehmbar nur um Christi willen.

Soll das nicht unser Interesse an unserm Kirchenbeitrag dermaßen heben, daß wir nach dem neuen Menschen den uns angeborenen Geiz und unsere Abgeneigtheit, für kirchliche Zwecke zu geben, bezwingen und unsern Beitrag für das Reich Gottes als eine Gnade von Gott erkennen, als ein gottwohlgefälliges Werk, das wir mit Freuden tun, eine Gabe von Gott zu Gott? Wie ganz anders wäre unsere Gefinnung und unsere Gabe, wenn wir noch unter dem Gesetz wären! Vgl. Kirchenbeitrag unter dem Gesetz und unter dem Evangelium.

2.

Zwar hat Christus alle Gläubigen frei gemacht von Gesetzen, unter denen wir als Fremde von Natur auch in bezug auf unsern Kirchenbeitrag wären. Aber durch sein Evangelium hat er den Kirchenbeitrag nicht aufgehoben, sondern Gott angenehm gemacht und unter das neue von ihm erfüllte Gebot getan. Wir zählen nun unsere Kirchenbeiträge, die regelmässigen wie die besonderen, 1. um Christi willen und nach seinem Willen, nach seiner Ordnung, nach seinem Exempel und Brauch; 2. um des Nächsten willen, dem unser Beitrag dient, und für ihn, wie Christus für Petrus, damit unser Überfluß seinen Mangel decke; 3. um Ärgernis zu verhüten.

Zur treuen (1 Kor. 4, 2; Matth. 25, 21. 23; Luf. 16, 10) Darreichung unserer Opfer gehört also, daß wir regelmäßig geben, nach dem Beispiel unsers Heilandes, eingedenk der evangelischen Freiheit, die Christus uns erworben hat, freiwillig, nicht aus Zwang (nur freiwillige Gaben sind Gott angenehm), daß wir dabei Ehrlichkeit, ja Ehrlichkeit

üben und uns davor scheuen, Ärgernis zu geben durch Enthaltung (Text) oder durch Prahlerei, Luf. 18, 12.

Wie steht es hiermit bei uns? Laßt uns auch in dieser Sache den Abglanz der Herrlichkeit Christi an uns tragen — jeder einzelne, alle Gemeinden, jeder Distrikt, die ganze Synode. G. H. Smula.

Vierundzwanzigster Sonntag nach Trinitatis.

Mark. 8, 34—38.

Durchs Kreuz zur Krone, durch Leiden zur Herrlichkeit. So war es bei Jesu, so ist es auch bei seinen Jüngern.

So war es bei Jesu. B. 31, 32a; vgl. Luf. 24, 26. Diese Worte waren dem Simon Petrus ärgerlich. Er (B. 32b; Matth. 16, 22) meinte, dem Messias Israels dürfe doch so etwas nicht widerfahren. Ja, das Wort vom Kreuz, gerade auch vom Kreuz Christi, ist der menschlichen Vernunft anstößig und ärgerlich. Die Vernunft erkennt eben nicht den Greuel der Sünde und hält ein solches Opfer wie das Kreuzesleiden Christi nicht für nötig zur Erlösung der Sündertwelt. — Jesus aber: B. 33. Jawohl, das ist kein göttlicher, sondern ein menschlicher, ja ein satanischer Gedanke, daß das Kreuzesleiden Christi nicht nötig sei zu unserer Erlösung. Gott schätzt die Sünde recht ein; sie ist in seinen heiligen Augen ein furchtbarer Greuel, so daß ein unermessliches Opfer erforderlich ist, sie zu sühnen und die sündige Menschheit zu erlösen. Daher: B. 31.

Aber auch wir Christen, wir Jünger Jesu, müssen durchs Kreuz zur Krone, durch usw. gehen. Freilich nicht in demselben Sinn wie Christus, nicht um auch noch selber, in etwas wenigstens, unsere Sünde zu sühnen, sondern um rechte Nachfolger Christi zu sein. Davon handelt unser Text. Wir erkennen daraus:

Auch wir Christen, wir Jünger Jesu, müssen durchs Kreuz zur Krone, durch Leiden zur Herrlichkeit.

1. Nachdem Jesus Simon Petrus zurechtgewiesen hatte, sprach er: B. 34. Wir Christen sind dazu berufen, daß wir Christo nachfolgen sollen. Welch ein hoher, herrlicher Beruf ist das! Einer, der Jesu Worte gehört und seine Werke geschaut hatte, rief begeistert aus: „Meister, ich will dir nachfolgen, wo [immer] du hingehst.“ Und nun von Gott berufen sein, Christo nachzufolgen!

2. Aber der Beruf in die Nachfolge Christi ist ein Beruf zum Leiden, oft zu schwerem Leiden. Simon Petrus schrieb später: 1 Petr. 2, 21. Ja, wir Christen sind dazu berufen, daß wir in der Weise Christo nachfolgen sollen, daß wir in die Fußtapfen seines Leidens treten. Petrus hat das an sich selbst reichlich erfahren: Schläge, Gefangenschaft, Märtyrertod, Apost. 4, 5; Joh. 21. Und wie hat Paulus leiden müssen, weil er Christo nachfolgte! Vordem hatte er gute Tage und stand bei der

Welt und der jüdischen Kirche in hohem Ansehen. Sobald er aber in die Nachfolge Christi trat, hieß es von ihm: Apost. 9, 16. Er selber sagt: 2 Kor. 11, 23—27. Und von sich und allen Christen sagt er: „Wir müssen durch viel Trübsal“ usw., Apost. 14, 22.

3. Warum muß das sein? Warum hat die Nachfolge Christi solches Leiden im Gefolge? Weil Teufel, Welt und der Christen eigenes Fleisch Christum und alle, die ihm angehören, hassen, Joh. 15, 18, 19. Und weil die Welt und ihr Fürst, der Teufel, Christum und die Seinen hassen, so bereiten sie diesen allerlei Leiden: Spott, Hohn, Verfolgung, mancherlei Trübsal. Das gefällt unserm alten Adam nicht; das schmeckt ihm bitter; er möchte dessen überhoben sein. Er möchte gute Tage haben und trachtet danach, sich diesem Leiden zu entziehen. Petrus in Antiochien, Gal. 2, 11, 12. Ja, Petri Verleugnung!

4. Wollen wir aber Jesu Jünger sein, so müssen wir uns selbst verleugnen, unsern Wünschen und Neigungen entlagen, ihnen Gewalt antun, unser Kreuz auf uns nehmen und so Christo nachfolgen.

„Denn wer sein“ usw., B. 35 a. Wer dies Kreuz abwerfen und sich ein gutes, angenehmes Leben erhalten will, der wird das ewige Leben, das Christus ihm erworben hat, verlieren. Der wird auch kein gutes Gewissen in diesem Leben und so keine wahrhaft guten Tage haben. Wie mancher Abtrünnige hat das an sich erfahren! Beispiele. — B. 35 b. Wer aber auf Erden ein gutes Leben und gar sein Leben überhaupt verliert, weil er Christo nachfolgt und sein Evangelium festhält, der behält das ewige Leben. Und das ist doch besser als das allerbeste Leben in dieser Welt. Denn: B. 36, 37. — Ja, wenn einer das Kreuz, das er als Nachfolger Christi tragen muß, abwerfen und Christo nicht mehr nachfolgen wollte und ihm dann vielleicht alle Herrlichkeit zuteil würde, die in dieser Welt zu erlangen wäre, was hülfte ihm das? Er würde ja den allererschrecklichsten Schaden nehmen an seiner Seele: er würde in die Hölle kommen, aus der er sich in keiner Weise erlösen könnte. Welch ein Tausch wäre das!

B. 38. Die ungläubigen Menschen sind ein ehebrecherisches und sündiges Geschlecht. Sie sind Gott untreu und laufen aus einer Sünde in die andere. Und wer Jesu nachfolgt und seine Worte festhält, den hassen diese Menschen und lachen ihn aus und verspotten ihn. Wenn der sich dann aber schämt, Jesum und seine Worte frei zu bekennen, dann wird Jesus sich auch schämen, ihn seinen Jünger zu nennen, wenn er kommen wird in der Herrlichkeit seines Vaters und mit den heiligen Engeln. Wie schrecklich wird das sein!

Und Jesus wird gewiß kommen in der Herrlichkeit usw., und alsdann wird er jedem Menschen nach seinen Werken vergelten, Matth. 16, 27. Jeden Ungläubigen wird er bestrafen wegen seiner im Unglauben getanen Werke; jeden seiner Jünger aber wird er aus Gnaden belohnen für die Werke, die er im Glauben verrichtet hat. — Ganz gewiß wird Jesus zu solchem Gericht kommen. Als er so zu dem Volk

und zu seinen Jüngern redete, da standen etliche dabei, die so lange lebten, bis das große Gericht über die ungläubigen Juden kam. Dies Gericht ist heute noch deutlich zu sehen. Und dies Gericht ist ein Zeichen und Anfang des allergrößten Gerichts am Ende der Welt.

Christ, nimm dein Kreuz auf dich und folge Christo nach! Dann trifft dich dieses Gericht nicht. Lied 280, 1. 7. J. A. Kimbach.

Outlines on the Eisenach Epistle Selections.*

First Sunday in Advent.

HEB. 10, 19—25.

At the portal of the new church-year we to-day stand in solemn awe, aware of the uncertainty of health and life and wondering what lies ahead of us. It is especially the spiritual side of our existence which is the object of our solicitous concern. Will the new year always find us firmly anchored in the wounds of Jesus, constant in faith, fervent in love, a temple of the Holy Spirit, ready to obey the final summons whenever it may come?

As thoughts of this nature surge into our minds, we are desirous of receiving a message from God which will be helpful to us at the beginning of another year's pilgrimage. In our text there is a word of admonition from the Lord which, while important at any time, is strikingly appropriate and pertinent to-day. It urges us to adopt

Three Resolutions

as we look into the future:—

1. *To cling to Jesus in true faith;*
2. *To confess our faith without wavering;*
3. *To admonish each other to be rich in good works.*

1.

The author of Hebrews is writing these hortatory sentences standing, as it were, before a splendid painting which he has just finished, showing Jesus as the true divine High Priest, as superior to the priests of the Old Covenant as an object is to the shadow it casts, as the Creator is to the creature. Having summarized in vv. 19—21 what he has taught on this all-important topic, he now draws practical conclusions from this teaching. Since the things mentioned are great truths, great realities, what must we resolve to do?

Resolve to go to Christ in true faith, he says, v. 22. It is merely

* It is the intention to furnish English outlines on the so-called Eisenach Epistle-lessons in the ensuing church-year. — EDITORS.

a figurative way of saying, Accept Christ as your Savior, boldly, unhesitatingly put your trust in Him.

Many people will not go to Christ because they try to make themselves believe they do not need Him. Cf. the Pharisee in the Temple, Luke 18, 9 ff. Others will not go to Him because they feel there are more interesting and attractive things beckoning them—the pleasures and riches of the world. Cf. the rich young man, Mark 10, 17 ff. Still others hesitate to draw near because they think their sins are too shocking, too black. Cf. Judas. Let us be like Zacchaeus, who went to Jesus although oppressed by a deep sense of his sinfulness.

How is it possible for sinners to come to Christ, the Holy One? His blood has been sprinkled on our hearts and has cleansed them so that we no longer need have an evil conscience, v. 22b. The shedding of His blood has paid our debts, unworthy though we were. Besides, there is the pure water of Baptism, in which He has conferred on us full forgiveness, v. 22c. We can be sure that, just as Baptism is a reality, so the forgiveness, too, is real.

Considering these divine measures and guarantees, there should be found in us not a weak faith, but full assurance of faith, v. 22.—Let the new year be one in which we are characterized by a strong faith.

2.

After having placed our hearts in the right relation to Christ, we shall have to consider the next resolution proposed to us: to confess our faith without wavering, v. 23. Professing our belief is an act which flows naturally, spontaneously, out of faith; that we still have to be admonished to engage in it is due to our sinful flesh. Cp. the words of Jesus, Matt. 12, 34: "Out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh," and the words of Paul, 2 Cor. 4, 13: "We believe and therefore speak."

Exalting the riches offered us in Christ is something we can do without fear of misleading people. One hesitates to recommend certain investments because their security is not above question. In speaking to people of Christ, one does not have to fear that a collapse of the market, or an unforeseen drought, or a sudden war, or a virulent epidemic will make the treasures one recommends lose their value. "He is faithful that promised," v. 23. God's infallible Word guarantees the utter reliability of the Gospel proclamation.

If the early Christians, who through confession of their faith often jeopardized liberty, possession of their property and life, were urged to confess Christ without wavering, how much more should we gladly testify to the faith that is in us when we, at least normally, can do so without any peril!

If our profession is rather weak, is it not because the fire in our heart is not burning so brightly as it should? Let the new year be one of courageous confession.

3.

The final resolution which we are urged to make refers to our duty to our fellow-Christians; we are admonished to exhort them to become rich in good works, v. 24. Note that what is here inculcated is a special manifestation of brotherly love. Can we confer a greater favor on a Christian brother than leading him into ways of godliness and charity? Before we admonish a fellow-Christian in this respect, we must of course show *ourselves* diligent in well-doing. The parable of the Mote and the Beam here has its application, Matt. 7, 3 ff.

In order to be able to admonish each other, we should not forsake our assemblies, our meetings, the services of our Church. The main reason of our assembling together is of course the hearing and learning of the Word. But the reason given here must not be overlooked either. When we meet, we have an opportunity to exert a good influence on each other. Let the topic of our conversation be not merely the weather or the political election.

Remember, the day is approaching, v. 25. This may be the last time that we meet to begin a new church-year. Let this move us to take these matters seriously. Hence let the new year be one of mutual admonition.

Having these resolutions in our heart and carrying them out, we shall find the new church-year to be a blessed period of our life, connecting us ever more closely with Jesus Christ, our High Priest, who is the same yesterday and to-day and forever.

W. ARNDT.



Miscellanea.

Notes on Baptizein.

Language has its accepted usage whether contained in a manuscript which subsequently was proved and accepted as canonical or whether it occurs in writings that naturally must remain uncanonical. While the New Testament Apocrypha and uncanonical gospels are not decisive and authoritative in matters of doctrine and practise, their usage of the Greek of their period is nevertheless of the greatest importance.

When Drs. Grenfell and Hunt, digging in the Fayoum for the Egypt Exploration Society, found their famous "Fragment of an Uncanonical Gospel" (The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, No. 840) in December 1905, they found a leaf rich in philological import. The Oxford University Press found the papyrus of sufficient importance to publish it in a special brochure apart from the voluminous *Graeco-Roman Memoirs V*.

The unknown author of the fragment used a small, not very regular uncial hand, round and upright, a type of writing pointing to a late fourth-century date. He uses some contractions common to theological manuscripts of that period, *viz.*, $\alpha\nu\omicron\varsigma = \acute{\alpha}\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\varsigma$, $\delta\delta = \Delta\alpha\upsilon\epsilon\acute{\iota}\delta$, and $\sigma\omega\rho = \sigma\omega\tau\eta\rho$. The text is practically complete with the exception of one of the lower corners, but here the lacunae admit of satisfactory if not certain, restoration.

The burden of this fascinating text is concerned with a conversation between the Savior (as Jesus is called throughout the fragment) and a chief priest, which takes place in the Temple. The Savior takes His disciples with Him into the "place of purification." Here they are met by a Pharisee. This chief priest and Pharisee reproaches them for having neglected to perform the necessary ceremonies of ablution before entering the sacred place. In the ensuing dialog Jesus asks the priest whether he is pure, and the latter answers by telling of the different purificatory rites which he had himself observed. Jesus' reply is crushing in that it contrasts outward with inward purity, the external bathing ($\lambda\upsilon\tau\rho\acute{\omicron}\nu$ and $\beta\alpha\pi\tau\iota\sigma\mu\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ are used synonymously) prescribed by Jewish ritual with the inward cleansing which His disciples had received in the waters of eternal life. Before the speech is concluded the fragment breaks off.

In its general outline the episode described in the fragment resembles Matt. 15, 1—20, and Mark 7, 1—23, where the Pharisees reproach the Lord because the disciples did not wash their hands when they ate bread, and are strongly rebuked. Clearly the present fragment belongs to a narrative covering the same ground as the canonical gospels, even more so than the "Fragment of a Lost Gospel," published together with the "New Sayings of Jesus" (Pp. Oxyr. 655), where a similar situation is discussed.

It will be remembered that in Luke 11, 38 the Pharisee was astonished that Jesus had not "baptized" Himself ($\acute{\epsilon}\beta\alpha\pi\tau\iota\sigma\theta\eta$) before meat; while Matt. 15, 2 says: $\omicron\upsilon \gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho \nu\acute{\iota}\pi\tau\omicron\nu\tau\alpha\iota \tau\acute{\alpha}\varsigma \chi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\rho\alpha\varsigma \delta\tau\alpha\iota \acute{\alpha}\rho\tau\omicron\nu \acute{\epsilon}\sigma\theta\acute{\iota}\omega\sigma\iota\nu$. There is little, if any, distinction between $\nu\acute{\iota}\pi\tau\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ and $\beta\alpha\pi\tau\iota\acute{\zeta}\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ in these passages. Mark (7, 3) records that the Pharisees, except they wash their

hands oft, eat not (ἐὰν μὴ νίψωνται τὰς χεῖρας). The subsequent verse replaces *wash* with *baptize*: except they wash (ἐὰν μὴ βαπτίσωνται, although it must be stated that Nestle here prefers a different reading), they eat not, and it is added that the Jews observe the custom to "baptize" the cups, pots, brazen vessels, and tables. One would run into considerable difficulty by endeavoring to visualize such "baptism" as submersion or immersion.

The fragment before us richly substantiates this usage of the *Koine* so faithfully reproduced in the New Testament and so sanely reflected in the Lutheran mode of baptism. Lines 9—19 of the uncanonical gospel read: "And a certain Pharisee, a chief priest, whose name was Levi [?], met them and said to the Savior, Who gave Thee leave to walk in this place of purification and to see these holy vessels when Thou hast not washed ¹⁾ nor yet Thy disciples have washed their feet? But defiled, Thou hast walked in this Temple, which is a pure place, wherein no other man walks except he has washed himself." (. . . μήτε ΛΟΥΣΑΜΕΝΩ μήτε μὴν τῶν μαθητῶν σου τοὺς πόδας ΒΑΠΤΙΣΘΕΝΤΩΝ; . . . ὅν οὐδεὶς ἄλλος εἰ μὴ ΛΟΥΣΑΜΕΝΟΣ).

Again (lines 30—33, 41—44): "The Savior answered and said unto him, Woe, ye blind, who see not; thou hast washed in these running waters wherein dogs and swine have been cast. . . . But I and my disciples, who, thou sayest, have not bathed, have been washed [or dipped] in the waters of eternal life." ('Ο σωτὴρ πρὸς αὐτὸν ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν, οὐαί, τυφλοὶ μὴ ὁρῶντες· σὺ 'ΕΛΟΥΣΩ τοῦτοις τοῖς χρομένοις ὕδασι ἐν οἷς κύνες καὶ χοῖροι βέβληνται . . . ἐγὼ δὲ καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ μου οὐδὲ λέγεις μὴ ΒΕΒΑΠΤΙΣΘΑΙ ΒΕΒΑΜΜΕΘΑ ἐν ὕδασι ζωῆς αἰωνίου.)

The fragment interchangeably employs λούειν, βάπτειν and βαπτίζειν. The first is used literally or merely ceremonially for washing or bathing the body. It is the λουτρόν, the bath (the water, not the vessel), regardless of whether one sits in it, submerges, takes merely a shower, or a sponge bath. The second verb, here used parallel to the first, usually means to dip, especially as in dyeing. (Cf. δίβαφα, twice-dyed garments; also Rev. 19, 13: ἱμάτιον βεβαμμένον αἵματι.) Βάπτειν is a less technical word than βαπτίζειν, but there is no real distinction between the two terms here. It is interesting to note, however, that the idea of a change, *viz.*, a change of color, as in dyeing, is implied by βάπτειν and connoted by βαπτίζειν; for the washing of the water with the word certainly changes the crimson or scarlet to a white, something which no human dye can accomplish. But God's dye and His chemistry is different from cold human science. Third, βαπτίζειν has been used specifically and technically for ceremonial dipping and submerging regardless of whether by immersion or affusion.

Thus the *usus loquendi* in the fragment from the Fayoum corresponds with the use of these verbs for washing and bathing in the Scriptures. Βαπτίζειν signifies *any* mode of washing (Mark 7, 4), and in its technical Christian sense, on good apostolic authority, a washing from sin. It may also be observed that Christian Baptism does not wash the body, but is a salutary washing of the soul (1 Pet. 3, 21). The power of Baptism is

1) Italics my own throughout.

not hidden in the water; so why should *much* water have more power than a little water? Such broad understanding of these ablutionary terms in Scripture is in complete agreement with the accepted usage of these verbs in the Greek of the Apostolic and Post-apostolic Age.²⁾

RICHARD T. DU BRAU.

The Strange Notion of a "Double Soteriology."

In a number of articles which have recently appeared we have again been amazed at the peculiar conception which certain theologians have concerning the term which they coined — "double soteriology." The meaning of this strange term seems to be this, that both Jesus and St. Paul taught two ways of salvation, one by works, the other by grace. The Sermon on the Mount is said to represent the first way of salvation; the teaching of the atonement is said to be the second way of salvation. The chief difficulty seems to be connected with the statement of Jesus: "This do, and thou shalt live," Luke 10, 28. Apparently the critics do not see that Jesus is presenting an "impossibility." If man were without sin, he certainly could and would keep the Law and thereby earn salvation. But this is an impossibility as man is now constituted since the Fall. And the words of Jesus bring home this truth with great emphasis. And the very same point is made by St. Paul again and again, especially in the Letter to the Galatians. If any fact stands out clearly in this letter it is that of the utter hopelessness to attain to salvation by one's own works. Whenever the Bible speaks of a way of works, it is for the purpose of showing man his utter inability to live up to the demands of the Law. Hence the notion of a "double soteriology" is utterly foreign to the spirit of the Gospel.

P. E. K.

Children's "Programs" for Christmas.

Recent trends in the matter of presenting the Christmas-story during the holy season show two peculiar aberrations. On the one hand there seems to be some danger of overemphasizing pageantry in the Church, so that the message of Christmas itself is not given the prominent position which it must retain in the Lutheran Church. In other words, people come in large numbers to enjoy the pageant, but the attendance at the regular service of preaching is small.

On the other hand there is a tendency to overlook the fact that the Lutheran Church has ever emphasized the congregation as such in attendance at any church service. As long as our Synod is in existence, we have had children's services at Christmas. But while the children are given prominence in this service, we must not forget that the entire congregation ought to take part in the sacrificial element of worship. The liturgy should take into account the full treasures of Christian forms and the uses of our Church. We have certain psalms which have from olden days been used for Christmas, and we have prayers and poems which are intended for adults as well as for children. Then, according to the well-known dictum of Luther, we should have a sermon, even though this be short.

2) Cp. Vol. III, 214.

In small churches it may be feasible to have a catechization, with individual children answering. But in large churches much of the blessing accruing from the catechization is lost because the individuals in the audience cannot hear clearly.

Another point that must be kept in mind is this, that everything which savors of a performance and places the individual into prominence has no place in a church service.

According to the best usage of the Lutheran Church very many of the Christmas "programs" now used in church-school and Sunday-school services should have been staged in the parish-house or school-hall. All pastors who really wish to follow the best traditions of Lutheran usage will select such liturgical Christmas services as will stress the participation of the entire congregation in such a service of worship and praise. We have a number of such services now available, and it will certainly be a step forward if we refuse to accept material which is not based upon sound liturgical study.

P. E. K.

Our Puritan Ancestry.

"We Reformed Episcopalians, along with the other evangelical Episcopalians, of whom a remnant remains, and along with orthodox Congregationalists, who have not altogether disappeared, are lineal descendants of the Puritans of the days of Elizabeth and James the First. They were members of the Church of England who wanted that Church to become as fully Reformed and Protestant as the Presbyterian Church of Scotland and the Reformed churches of Switzerland, France, Holland, and Germany. Their austerity, which in popular thinking was their chief mark, which actually was only incidental and was one of the characteristics of the times, we have lost—all of us, with rare exceptions. In their revulsion from Romanism they were not free from fanaticism, and some of their descendants, it may be in lesser degree, show the same trait. But historically they are our spiritual ancestors, and we have reason to be proud of our genealogy if we are true to the teachings of the Word of God.

"The political compromises of Elizabeth in her ordering of the revised *Book of Common Prayer* at the outset of her reign barred the way equally to the reestablishment of the Church of Rome and to the establishing of a truly Reformed Church in her kingdom. She knew that to return to the reformation movement of the short reign of Edward VI would alienate the preponderant Roman Catholic element in the Church, and to follow the lead of Romish Mary would disrupt the Church. More martyrdoms would hasten rather than block the impending schism. The *Prayer-book* was so amended and rubricated as to placate both parties, and at least outwardly and temporarily it succeeded. Ever since, the Church of England and in later turn the Protestant Episcopal Church have had outward unity and inward strife.

"But the reformation movement in England soon took on new life and activity. The reformers were dubbed 'Puritans.' The term was one of sarcasm and scorn; it deserved a fairer and truer significance. It led to separation from the Romish-Reformed Church of England. The Independents were the children of the Puritans; the Pilgrims at our

Plymouth Rock were the grandchildren; the Puritans of Salem and Boston soon also became Independents—Congregationalists. The evangelicals in the Church of England and, later, in the Protestant Episcopal Church and, still later, those who organized and continued the Reformed Episcopal Church have simply sustained the Puritan principles. We fight against Popery, prelacy, priestcraft; *against all doctrines of saving grace through the vehicle of the Sacraments*; against ritualism; we stand for episcopacy without autocracy, the liturgy without ritualism, *immediate saving grace through faith*, the Bible as the infallible Word of God. We belong to the diminishing company of stalwart modern Puritans."

The above paragraphs are taken from the *Episcopal Recorder*, published in the interest of the Reformed Episcopal Church. In the summary of principles the points which we have underscored would seem particularly valuable in characterizing this church-body.

P. E. K.

Genesis Upheld.

When the sixth annual Saginaw Bible Conference was conducted last May, one of the chief speakers was Dr. Arthur I. Brown, who is described as a Canadian scientist, surgeon, and Bible-expositor. From the newspaper reports of his addresses we quote the following: "No book has so taxed the minds of ancient and modern scholars as this—Genesis. It is concerned with the most mysterious of questions—the origin of the universe. Early chapters of this sublime record are not myths nor allegories, but accurate history and absolute science. No one has ever been able to discover any disagreement between Genesis and a proved science. Genesis proves modern science to be true. The Bible needs no corroboration from man. God is the Author, and His writing is infallible truth. The reason that Genesis has been considered by some uninformed people to be a sort of fairy-talk, is because evolution has been thought to be the method by which things animate and inanimate came into being rather than by fiat creation. All facts go to show that 'in the beginning God created' is the only logical and scientific solution of the problem of origins.

"Evolution is the world's most colossal hoax. There is a popular idea fostered by the confident, but unsupported assertions of the ardent protagonists of this baseless theory that creation has been relegated to the limbo of myth and superstition by the discoveries of modern science. This is very far from the truth. The pendulum of scientific thinking, especially on the continent of Europe, is swinging away from the concept of a bestial origin for man. Many of the foremost scientists in the world, like Deperret, Carazzi, Valetton, Fleischmann, the zoologist of Erlangen University, Germany, Douglas Dewar, and others, are now unequivocally renouncing any belief in evolution. And this not because of any religious bias, but simply because the theory has collapsed and has failed to prove its absurd claims." This is plain and cheering testimony.

A.



Theological Observer. — *Religions-Zeitgeschichtliches.*

I. Amerika.

The New History Society and Its New Religion.—As the *Sunday-school Times* (July 11) suggests, the New History Society takes its name apparently from its ambitious program—the establishment of the United States of the World and of a universal religion. The *Sunday-school Times* writes in part: “The society was founded in 1928 and is, we are told, based on Bahaist principles. Among its speakers have been John Haynes Holmes, Rabbi Wise, John Dewey, Einstein, Mrs. Sanger, Tagore, and a son of Tolstoy. The chief activities of the organization so far have involved the offering of money prizes in international competition on the promotion of world peace and similar subjects. The theme for one competition was, ‘How Can Youth Contribute to the Realization of a Universal Religion?’ Among the judges were the names of Bishop Fred Fisher, Devere Allen, editor of *The World To-morrow*, Dr. Henry F. Atkinson, General Secretary of the World Conference for International Peace through Religion, and a number of Unitarian ministers. Enterprises of this type and parliaments of religion have always had a peculiar attraction for Unitarians. One way of getting rid of Christianity is to submerge and drown it in a union of religions. This ends Christianity’s uniqueness and its absolute demands on the human heart. Competition for this fourth series of prizes was confined to young people of Asia. Its sponsors declare the result to have shown ‘that the rising generation in all countries has been caught in a new vibration. Following the footsteps of its spiritual ancestors, Buddha, Confucius, Lao-tse, Moses, Christ, Baha-U-llah, it has discarded sectarianism and comes out boldly for the religion of progress and love. Never before has the youth of Asia had the opportunity to express its hopes. Youth has made up its mind to annihilate dogmas and to build in their place a fairer edifice.’ The writers are then characterized as ‘charter members of the order of the great companions,’ ‘the heralds of a new dawn,’ ‘the harbingers of a new spring,’ ‘the stars guiding travelers to a world of idealism, of peace, and of immortal bliss.’ We swim in pure azure! What are we to say about this? The proposed religion of progress and love is not the Christian religion. In these essays the name of Christ is not once named save in the customary series, Buddha, Confucius, Jesus. The idea of salvation does not appear, nor does the word sin. ‘Religion’ is but a rhetorical synonym for friendliness and optimism. The dark and tragic in human nature, man’s personal spiritual needs and agencies, are not referred to. We are in a ‘summer land’ like that of the Spiritists, which is supposed to welcome all after death. Strange that in the present mad welter, as of a burning building, these young people are not looking for a way of escape. They deem themselves sufficient at every point and feel no need of a Savior. One writes from Madras: ‘Youth will play the major part in establishing a universal religion. They inherit all the best in the world and have the power to erect a new civilization, avoiding the blunders of the past. Their minds are at least not petrified by blind dogmas.’ The Tokyo lad, Shoji Kimura, writes: ‘Youth must rise and take the world

by the hand and say, 'This way.' Another Japanese, who bears the Christian name of Paul and who writes from the Doshisha Mission College (Congregationalist), says: 'We are scientific-minded. Our perspective is not refracted by prior experience. Consequently we can provide the vision for the new social order and draw blue-prints for it. We have a superabundance of energy with which to fire the crucible of modern events.' — 'Create a universal Bible,' cry these youths, 'based on the teaching of all prophets, saints, and thinkers.' 'Publish a universal holy book,' writes a student in the American Mission College (Presbyterian) in Beirut. They call for 'world mansions' in capitals of the nations as headquarters of a world religion. They would organize a Board of Missions to establish missions of the universal religion in all the cities of the world. They would hold religious world congresses, 'an annual celebration, in the leading cities of the world, of a Pantheon of universal religion where all religions will gather together to sing one universal song of love, pray one universal prayer of love, worship one universal lord of love.' 'All religious institutions, churches, mosques, synagogues, should be utilized for the realization of a universal religion.' — That's enough. This 'movement' has already drowned itself in verbiage. We in America are not unfamiliar with that verbiage. Miss Louis Pin Chang, first prize-winner, talks about the 'democracy of God,' a phrase of Shailer Mathews's invention; others roll under their tongues Dr. Fosdick's cherished word 'modern.' It is worth noting that sixty-eight of those competing describe themselves as Christians, the next largest group to the eighty Hindus. Does not this mean that these young people have had their training in mission colleges? Can it be true that this verbiage is the religious colloquial in these colleges?"

No doubt, what the *Sunday-school Times* here suggests is true. Any one who knows the destructive attacks of Modernists upon the Christian religion can readily understand also what should prompt them to establish a "world religion" in which Jesus would count no more than Confucius or Buddha or Mohammed. It is the total destruction of the Gospel of the crucified Christ which the advocates of this new "world religion," which is nothing else than the old naturalistic religion of the carnal heart, has in view.

J. T. M.

Modification of the Mexican Government Attitude Allows Reopening of Churches. So reports a correspondent of the *Christian Century*. "Already the government is showing a more conciliatory attitude. Wide attention was given to a recent address of President Cardenas in Guadalajara, in which he declared that the religious question had been given overimportance; that the main aim of his administration is social and economic transformation; and that the government should not promote antireligious campaigns, thus sowing discord and impeding constructive accomplishment. This was followed a few days later by an official statement to the effect that the government would not oppose the reopening of churches in those places where they had been closed without federal authorization. Already churches are being reopened on the large north-western states of Sinaloa, Sonora, and Chihuahua, where they had been closed for a year and a half or longer. Local difficulties continue however. Within the past week in the state of Guanajuato a clash between Catholics

on one side and agrarians and rural teachers on the other resulted in the death of fifteen persons and the wounding of fourteen others. An official bulletin places the blame upon Catholic fanatics, who attacked teachers attending a cultural mission when they were putting on a social program in one of the public gardens." A.

Mr. Babson and the Congregationalists. — When Mr. Roger Babson was elected Moderator of the Congregational and Christian Churches, in convention assembled at Mount Holyoke, this was looked upon as a victory for the Conservatives. We read with interest what an editorial in the *Christian Century* stated about Mr. Babson: "Mr. Babson has long been interested in religion and its relation to business. He has many times said that a revival of religion is necessary to a revival of business. This can be of course a highly dangerous doctrine. The notes he struck at Mount Holyoke, however, were quite innocuous. He proposes to replenish Congregationalism by increasing the birth rate in Congregational families. If the clergy fails to stop the ebbing of the membership in certain Congregational churches by regeneration, he proposes that the laity do it by generation! Some years ago Mr. Babson proposed that the salary of ministers be determined by the number of new members they brought into the church during the year! Apart from the merit of his specific ideas, it may prove that Mr. Babson's emphasis upon responsibility of the laity — the deacons and trustess, and the rank and file — will be a wholesome one." The editorial before us states that during the next two years, according to a vote of the convention (called General Council), a denominational plebiscite will be held on questions concerning the economic order, which course the *Christian Century* construes as the entering upon "a new dimension of Christian responsibility." While this plan may acquaint Congregationalists with the questions studied in courses of sociology, we are quite sure that it will not result in what the *Christian Century* predicts, "a reconstructed and regenerated Church." A.

Will the Presbyterian Church of America be Compelled to Change Its Name? — The *Presbyterian* of August 27 writes as follows, respecting the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America (Northern Presbyterians): "Our Church has filed a bill in equity in the common pleas court of Pennsylvania seeking to restrain the Presbyterian Church of America from its use of this name and title. The moderator, stated clerks, and members of the General Assembly's special committee, appointed last May to guard rights and property, are the plaintiffs. The brief charges that the new organization is engaged 'in a successful campaign to induce members and individual churches of the plaintiff Church to withdraw therefrom with the church property and to bring themselves and said property into membership and support' of the Presbyterian Church of America. It charges that the defendant Church is organized on the same platform of standards and asserts itself to be 'the spiritual successor' of our Church. The brief declares that here and abroad the new Church seeks to grow, and to accomplish these objects, 'through the impairment and disintegration of the organization and work of the plaintiff Church.' 'The principles and practises of comity which prevail among all other Protestant evangelical churches and societies have been openly

disavowed by the defendant,' it is stated. It asserts that our Church is generally known in the world to be 'the prerepresentative of what is known as Presbyterianism in America.' An 'irreparable' injury is claimed if this name is allowed to stand. The defendants have not yet filed a reply." The outcome of this suit will be watched with interest, although from this distance it appears that the plaintiff has no case. A.

Has the Teaching of Immersion been Abandoned in Some Influential Baptist Quarters?—An editorial in the *Christian Century* of July 22, having the heading "No Immersionist Bloc," makes a frank remark about immersion which our readers will be interested to see: "Certainly the old claim of both Disciples and Baptists that there is some authoritarian basis for immersion either in the Scriptures or in the commandment of Jesus has no longer a leg to stand upon. Baptism is not immersion, as Alexander Campbell taught. Neither, however, is it sprinkling or any other physical act. It is the *social* act of initiating a proper candidate into the membership of the Christian Church. That this act has results, that it makes a difference, who will deny? But the results do not flow from the isolated act in its organic meaning as incorporation into the body of Christ." If we understand the author correctly, he definitely admits that the Bible does not teach that baptism must be by immersion. There is much which one has to object to in the second part of the paragraph, but we agree with the author when he maintains that neither immersion nor sprinkling is prescribed as the proper mode of baptizing. That a statement of this sort was made in a journal which is supposed to represent the views or principles of the Disciples, commonly regarded a Baptist sect, gives it special significance. A.

"A Far-Sighted Liberal."—Under this heading *Christianity To-day* (September, 1936) writes: "A Universalist preacher writing in the *Nation's Business*, decries the tendency in his Church and in the Federal Council of Churches to spend their energies in social betterment. He says: 'Instead of the words of Christ "Seek ye first the kingdom of God and His righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you," we are now told: Seek ye first what ye shall eat and drink and wherewithal ye shall be clothed, and the kingdom of God and His righteousness will then be added unto you. When all your economic schemes have been put into action; when your planned economy has been duly planned; when the capitalistic system has gone down to the dead gods and broken things; when your cooperative state, whatever may be its shape, has risen upon the ruins, your real task remains the same. The beneficiaries of your idealism are not going to flock to your altars to thank you for your mistaken intervention. They are going to be as far from the kingdom of God as ever; and you will have to return to the old preaching of righteousness with all the vigor and enthusiasm that may be left after liberty has been destroyed and the planned economy, which will not include you in its plans, has been introduced.'" That means, more briefly expressed: "Your whole social-gospel scheme is bound to turn out to be a wretched failure, and besides, by your social gospel you are not going to make any one a Christian." But why, then, remain a Universalist?

J. T. M.

Laymen and the Preaching of the Social Gospel. — An article in the *Christian Century* seems to be telling the truth when it depicts the viewpoints of the clergy and the laity with respect to the social gospel as follows: "There is a gulf between the clergy and the laity in their ways of thinking and socially applied religion. Perhaps it would show more consideration for the men of our churches, who are, by and large, men of good will, if it should be said that there is a gulf between the spiritual viewpoint on life as enunciated by the pulpit and the practical exigencies of life as encountered by the laymen. Those practical considerations involve cargoes of such value that many laymen prefer not to place them in the hazardous care of ministerial pilots. They say that the pulpit should leave social and economic questions quite alone. This is one danger avoided, but so is the possibility of a commerce offering great rewards. However we may describe the gulf, it surely exists." The writer then outlines what is called the "new partnership" plan, which is sponsored by the Unitarian Laymen's League and which "proposes to construct a bridge of understanding over that gulf. It assays the difficult task of achieving a group conscience on the part of religious-minded people with respect to the vital social, economic, and political issues of the day, a conscience that shall represent the joint conclusions of ministers and laymen." Coming from the Unitarians, who have not much of a theology to preach, the plan does not cause great surprise. The writer, however, is justified in holding that the gulf he speaks of exists not only in Unitarian churches, but in all the denominations where the social gospel is preached. A.

Judge Upholds Right to Refuse Salute to Flag. — Sacramento, Cal. (NCJC.) — In the first test case in California, Judge Peter J. Shields has granted a mandamus writ to Joseph Gabrielli, compelling the Sacramento school authorities to readmit his nine-year-old daughter Charlotte. The family are members of Jehovah's Witnesses, and Charlotte was suspended for refusing to salute the flag.

Judge Shields says: "The Constitution states that the free exercise and enjoyment of religious profession and worship, without discrimination or preference, shall forever be guaranteed in this State." However, he insisted that the objection to the salute must be "purely religious in character," adding: "If there is any particle of political or social purpose involved in the matter, her action will not be tolerated." — *Living Church*.

Brief Items. — "Although it has taken but one per cent. of the ministers and but five per cent. of the members, the newly organized Presbyterian Church of America has begun to grow. Three presbyteries have been started: New Jersey, New York and New England, and Philadelphia. The Knox Presbyterian Church of Philadelphia was the first to unite with the new Church. An interesting debate at the Philadelphia presbytery hinged on eschatological liberty as one church wanted to make sure it would always have a premillennial pastor. The Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions now has nineteen missionaries," some located in China, others in India, Japan, Manchukuo, and Peru. What missionary zeal! But we note that the germ of serious dissension is in the new body because some of its members are given to the premillennial vagaries; so the body from the very start is a house divided against itself. The part of this

item which is in quotation-marks is taken from the *Christian Century*.— At Lachish, where archeological research is going on, "three specimens of alphabetical script were found. One is penned on the remains of a ewer in a temple; the second around a red bowl in a tomb; and the third on another piece of pottery. They all belong to the period B. C. 1295—1262 and are considered as the connecting link between the Phenician and the oldest alphabetical script which was found in the peninsula of Sinai engraved on stones." (*Christian Century*.) — It is reported that Presbyterian missions in Korea are considering closing their schools at which secular education is carried on because the Japanese government demands that at times all schools must engage in public obeisance at Japanese shrines.— The *Presbyterian* prints the Gunning Prize Essay of 1934, written by Rev. De Hart-Davies, M. A., D. D., having the heading "Biblical History in the Light of Archeological Discovery since A. D. 1900." The author very properly confines his attention to the chief points of interest in this field. Looking over the chapter headings, ten in number, one must say that he has selected the matters that have been given chief prominence in this endeavor during the last decades. Those of our readers who are particularly interested in archeological research, as far as it has bearing on the trustworthiness of the Scriptures, should try to obtain a copy of this essay.— A person does not have to be a friend of the Papacy to stand aghast at the news of religious persecution perpetrated in Spain these days. Nor does the consideration that the Roman Catholic Church through its exploitation of the masses and through its policy of keeping its members ignorant brought this disaster upon itself reduce the enormity of the atrocities that are reported. An item appearing in one of our exchanges late in August reads: "The Pope has been officially notified that one Spanish bishop has been burned alive and four others murdered by radical mobs, according to a Universal Service dispatch from Vatican City. The report stated that the Bishop of Sigüenza was tarred and burned at the stake. The other bishops reported murdered were those of Jaén, Lerida, Segordia, and Barbastro. The Vatican also was notified that the Archbishop of Toledo and the Bishop of Madrid have been forced to flee for their lives."— What are the prominent present theological tendencies? A writer in the *Living Church*, reviewing a book by Edwin Ewart Aubrey, entitled *Present Theological Tendencies*, gives this convenient, helpful summary: "Dr. Aubrey's classification shows 1) modernism (a method rather than a creed, and on the wane); 2) dialectical theology ('Father' Kierkegaard and his variant children — Barth, Brunner, and, painfully, Reinhold Niebuhr); 3) neo-Thomism (the revival of "rational" theology in Maritain, Dawson, Wust, and other Catholics); 4) naturalism (a diverse group, including Dewey as well as Wieman and among theistic naturalists both Bergson and General Smuts); and 5) the 'new supernaturalists' like Dean Inge, Dr. Temple, and D. C. Macintosh." It may give us some satisfaction that conservative Biblical theology is not listed among the "tendencies."— Ritualists, as is well known, have a tendency to debate things that are of little moment. In Greece, for instance, the Orthodox Church is convulsed and rocked with respect to the question whether the Julian calendar may be set aside and the Gregorian, now used quite generally in Christian countries, be adopted. What a pity to see people spend immense amounts

of energy on things that do not matter! — From Geneva comes the news that Protestant churches in Spain have suffered very little damage. In several instances where incendiaries planned destruction of Protestant church edifices they were persuaded to change their minds. One must not forget, of course, that in all Spain there are only about six thousand Protestants. — Die *Evangelisch-Lutherische Freikirche*, the official organ of our brethren in Germany, has issued a special number, in which the sessions of their last convention are well reported and the sixtieth anniversary of their church organization is fittingly commemorated. One hundred copies may be obtained for 18 marks. A.

II. Ausland.

Ein gewaltiges Zeugnis gegen Irrlehre. Wir unterbreiten unsern Lesern eine Kundgebung des bayerischen Landeskirchenrats, unterzeichnet von D. Meiser, die bestimmt war, am 13. Sonntag nach Trinitatis auf den Kanzeln der lutherischen Landeskirche Bayerns verlesen zu werden. Gott gebe, daß dieses Zeugnis nicht auf dem Papier stehenbleibt!

I.

So spricht unser Herr: „Es wird eine Herde und ein Hirte werden.“

Als unser Herr dies Wort sagte, hat er an das Schicksal seiner Gemeinde, seiner Kirche, gedacht. Er hat die Not seiner Gemeinde und den Jammer seiner Kirche gesehen, daß sie nicht immer „eine Herde“ ist, daß sie getrennt ist und zerpalten und zerrissen. Aber mit seinem Wort von der einen Herde gibt er die Verheißung, daß diese Not und dieser Jammer nicht bleiben sollen, sondern daß die Zeit kommt, wo alle Trennungen und Spaltungen überwunden werden, wo alle, die Christen sein wollen, einmütig und einstimmig ihn loben und ehren.

Mit dieser Verheißung hat der Herr uns die starke Sehnsucht ins Herz gelegt nach dieser „einen Herde“, hat er uns die Aufgabe gegeben, daß wir arbeiten und kämpfen und beten um die Einheit der Kirche.

Aber er sagt nicht nur das Wort von der „einen Herde“, sondern auch das Wort von dem „einen Hirten“. Die „eine Herde“ ist nur da, wo der „eine Hirte“ ist.

Damit ist die klare Linie gezogen: Wir sollen arbeiten und kämpfen und beten um die eine Kirche; aber die Einheit der Kirche kann sich nur da gestalten, wo man an den Herrn Christus glaubt, an den wirklichen Christus, nicht an einen erdichteten und exträumten. Nur wo dieser Glaube ist, kann es die eine Kirche geben; nur der Glaube an den, der unser Herr und Heiland ist, kann die Trennungen und Spaltungen aufheben, die durch die Christenheit hindurch gehen. Wo wir aber die „eine Herde“ wollen ohne den „einen Hirten“, wo wir die Einheit der Kirche schaffen wollen ohne den Glauben an Christus, handeln wir wider den Willen des Herrn. So wird es nie und nimmer zu einer Kirche kommen.

II.

Es geht durch unser Volk zur Zeit ein leidenschaftliches Rufen nach der Einheit der Kirche. Es sind vor allem die Thüringer Deutschen Christen, die diesen Ruf erheben. Sie wollen die sogenannte Nationalkirche. Eine Kirche soll sein, die die ganze Nation umfaßt, deren Mitglied jeder ist, der

zur deutschen Nation gehört. Es soll nicht mehr geben Lutheraner und Reformierte, Protestanten und Katholiken; ja, es scheint, als wollten sie ihre Tore auch für diejenigen öffnen, die sich überhaupt nicht mehr zum Herrn Christus bekennen. Der neuen Nationalkirche sollen ohne weiteres alle angehören, die die deutsche Volksgemeinschaft bejahen.

Auf den Kanzeln soll alles gepredigt werden dürfen, was irgendwie der deutschen Wiedergeburt entspricht und sie fördert.

Zur Durchsetzung dieses Zieles in der Kirche soll nötigenfalls die Hilfe des Staates in Anspruch genommen werden.

III.

Es hat den Anschein, als würde der Plan der Nationalkirche dem Wort Jesu entsprechen von der „einen Herde“. Aber es ist dabei eben das vergessen, daß der Herr fortfährt „und ein Hirte“. Es geht denen, die die Nationalkirche wollen, nicht mehr wirklich um den „einen Hirten“.

Man redet wohl bei ihnen vom Heiland; aber es ist nicht mehr der Heiland der Bibel. Man redet wohl vom Christenglauben; aber es ist nicht der Christenglaube, den Gottes Barmherzigkeit durch seinen Knecht Luther dem deutschen Volk wiedergeschenkt hat.

Man weiß in diesen Kreisen nicht, daß Christus der Herr ist und daß nichts neben ihm Platz hat. Das Volk ist ihnen so wichtig wie der Herr Christus, ja wichtiger als der Herr Christus. Darum konnte einer der führenden Thüringer Deutschen Christen erklären, um der Einheit des deutschen Volkes willen sei er bereit, auch den Herrn Christus daranzugeben.

Man weiß in diesen Kreisen nichts von dem tödlichen Ernst, der in der Vorherrschaft Jesu liegt. Vor ihm ist alles menschliche Wesen, auch das edelste, verloren und verdammt. Sie aber verkündigen, daß, wer nur recht deutsch sei, auch ein rechter Christ sei.

Man weiß bei ihnen nichts davon, daß der Herr Christus der einzige und Einmalige ist und daß sein Erlösungswerk etwas einziges und Einmaliges ist. Der Herr Christus ist ihnen nur einer von denen, die durch den Einsatz ihres Lebens Erlösung bringen. Vor allem predigen sie, daß auch Deutschland mit seinem Schicksal religiöse Erlösung schaffe. Das Leid Deutschlands seit 1914 wird ihnen zu einem zweiten Golgatha; der Aufbruch Deutschlands seit 1933 wird ihnen zu einem neuen Ostern.

Es sind unter ihnen Leute, die noch weiter gehen. In leichtfertiger Weise reden sie vom Werk Jesu Christi. Opfertod und Blut Christi nennen sie überflüssigen Kram, den der deutsche Mensch von heute nicht mehr brauche.

So steht ihre Lehre in Widerspruch zur Lehre der Lutherischen Kirche und zur Lehre der Bibel. Ihre Lehre ist Zirkellehre.

IV.

Eine Kirchenleitung, die sich gebunden weiß an das Evangelium, muß gegen solche Zirkellehre aufstehen, muß sich mit aller Kraft, die ihr geschenkt ist, gegen solche Zirkellehre zur Wehr setzen. Die Leitung der bayerischen Landeskirche weiß um diese ihre Pflicht und wird im gegebenen Augenblick das tun, was notwendig ist.

Man wird uns vorwerfen: Das ist nichts anderes als Gezänk der Schriftgelehrten und Theologen, die ihren Glauben nur im Kopf haben, aber nicht im Herzen. Man wird uns vorwerfen, daß wir mit dem Kampf gegen

diese Lehre lieblos und selbstgerecht die Einheit der Kirche und die Einheit des Volkes zerreißen.

Mag man das von uns sagen, wenn man's nicht lassen kann!

Wir wissen, es gibt nicht allerlei Herren, sondern nur den einen Herrn; darum gibt es nicht allerlei Wahrheiten, sondern nur die eine Wahrheit; darum gibt es auch nicht allerlei Evangelien, sondern nur das eine Evangelium von dem Christus, der da gestorben ist für unsere Sünden nach der Schrift und begraben und auferstanden am dritten Tage nach der Schrift. Wo nicht einzig und allein dieses Evangelium verkündigt wird, da wird die Ehre des Herrn Christus verletzt; denn man hat aus ihm etwas anderes gemacht, als was er selber sein wollte.

Wo das geschieht, da wird unser Volk um den Trost seines Gewissens und um das Heil seiner Seele betrogen. Denn allein das biblische Evangelium rettet unser Volk von Sünde und Tod.

Um der Ehre Christi willen darf die Kirche kein anderes Evangelium verkündigen, darf sie kein anderes Evangelium dulden auf ihren Kanzeln. Um des Heiles unsers Volkes willen muß sie unerbittlich scheiden zwischen Wahrheit und Lüge.

Gott weiß, daß wir nicht mit leichtem Herzen so urteilen und richten und den Kampf kämpfen gegen die falsche Lehre. Aber es ist das Wort Gottes, das da scheidet zwischen Lüge und Wahrheit, zwischen Lehre und Irrlehre, zwischen Glauben und Unglauben.

Wer kann wider das Wort Gottes?

Weil wir gebunden sind an das Wort Gottes, können wir auf die Ver-
suche, die auf diese Weise die deutsche Nationalkirche schaffen wollen, nur antworten mit einem entschiedenen und entschlossenen Nein. Niemand und nichts kann uns zwingen, daß wir zu einer solchen Kirche ja sagen.

Man wird uns dann vorwerfen, daß wir nicht zu unserm deutschen Volk stehen. Mag man sagen, was man nicht lassen kann! Wir befehlen diese Sache Gott. Er weiß, daß wir bereit sind, unserm Volk jedes Opfer zu bringen. Ein Opfer aber dürfen wir nicht bringen, das ist das Opfer der Wahrheit.

Was wollten wir lieber, als daß es eine Kirche in unserm deutschen Volke gäbe! Wir trauern, daß wir im Heiligtum Gottes nicht gemeinsam stehen können; daß die einen dahin gehen und die andern dorthin. Aber zur Einheit der Kirche gibt es nur einen Weg: Unser deutsches Volk von oben bis unten muß sich bekennen zum Evangelium; unser Volk muß sich Mann für Mann befehren zu ihm, der gesagt hat: „Ich bin der Erste und der Letzte und der Lebendige. Ich war tot, und siehe, ich bin lebendig von Ewigkeit zu Ewigkeit und habe die Schlüssel der Hölle und des Todes.“

Gottes Heiliger Geist stehe uns bei, daß wir alle, Kirchenleitung und Pfarrer und Kirchengemeinden, treue Zeugen dieses Herrn werden! Und er, der Herr der Kirche, wird allen treuen Zeugendienst segnen und schaffen, daß zu seiner Zeit werde ein Hirte und eine Herde. A.

Das Wachstum des Katholizismus in Afrika. Nach einer in dem Missionsblatt „Allgemeine Missionsnachrichten“ veröffentlichten Mitteilung aus der römischen Missionszeitschrift „Die katholischen Missionen“ ist Afrika gegenwärtig das bei weitem fruchtbarste Feld der katholischen Missionsarbeit. Im Jahre 1933 zählte die katholische Mission insgesamt auf den verschiedenen Missionsfeldern 16.6 Millionen Katholiken und 2.6 Millionen

Taufbewerber. In Afrika betrug die Zahl fünf Millionen Katholiken und zwei Millionen Taufbewerber. In diesem Jahr entfallen 61.7 Prozent der Neuebekehrten auf Afrika. Wie riesig rasch die römische Mission in Afrika gewachsen ist, ergibt sich aus den folgenden Zahlen: Im Jahre 1918 zählte man in Afrika 1.87 Millionen Katholiken, im Jahre 1923 2.66 Millionen, im Jahre 1929 3.90 Millionen. Am stärksten ist der Fortschritt im Missionswachstum in Zentralafrika und da wieder in der Nordwestecke des früheren Deutschostafrika und in Ruanda und Urundi, dem jetzt belgischen Mandatsgebiet. Gerade dort aber wird den deutschen evangelischen Missionen, die früher hier mit großem Erfolg gearbeitet haben, der Zutritt verweigert. Daß die römische Mission natürlich auf Kosten der protestantischen, die von den Römischen vielfach verdrängt wird, Fortschritte macht, darüber ist schon längst in den evangelischen Missionszeitschriften aufs bitterste geklagt worden. Rom hat vorwiegend dort seine Triumphe gefeiert, wo die große Armut es den deutschen Evangelischen unmöglich machte, ihr Werk fortzusetzen.

J. T. W.

Antimasonic Action. — From the correspondence of the *Christian Century* emanating from Tokyo, Japan, we clip the following paragraph: "American Masons will be surprised to learn what the Kanagawa prefectural police has discovered concerning the amazing international institution of Freemasonry. It is a powerful secret order, having headquarters in the United States, 'composed mostly of people of Jewish extraction.' Secret orders are strictly forbidden in Japan, and as this one is said to have been active in the French Revolution, the Russian Revolution, the World War, and even in the League of Nations' treatment of the Sino-Japanese embroglio, the Japanese police and gendarmes are concerned over its possible activities in Japan."

Wacht und Weide. Vor uns liegt das zweite Heft des ersten Jahrgangs von „Wacht und Weide“, dem spezifisch theologischen Organ unserer Brüder in Südamerika. Wir freuen uns sowohl über den Inhalt dieser neuen theologischen Zeitschrift wie über den Ton, den sie anschlägt. Eingeleitet wird die Nummer durch ein sehr zeitgemäßes Vorwort, worin die rechte Stellung der treulutherischen Kirche dem Jertum unserer Zeit gegenüber fein charakterisiert wird. Dann folgt ein ermutigender Artikel über den großen Missionsbefehl Christi, Mark. 16, 15, mit rechter Kennzeichnung der Aufgabe des christlichen Predigers. Daran reiht sich ein dogmatisch-exegetischer Artikel über Matth. 3, 11, ein Aufsatz über „Die Lehre vom Veruf unter gegenwärtigen Verhältnissen“, eine sehr feine Katechese, praktische Artikel verschiedenen Inhalts, auch einen über den Schulbau, Nachrichten und Bemerkungen, Bücherbesprechungen usw. Wer das Geld dazu hat, sollte sich diese interessante Zeitschrift bestellen. In unserm Concordia-Verlag kann man erfahren, wie hoch sich der Bestellungspreis von 10\$000 oder auch drei Besos gegenwärtig beläuft, etwa zwischen ein und zwei Dollars. Die Zeitschrift dient nicht nur Pastoren, sondern auch Lehrern, und sie verdankt ihr Erscheinen der Tatsache, daß das bisherige Blatt, das ja für das Christenvolk insgemein bestimmt ist, seinem Zweck nicht mehr genügt. Daß unsere Brüder in Südamerika es wagen, eine solche Zeitschrift ins Leben zu rufen, zeugt von hohem Mut. Glück auf zum guten Werk! Heil dem Fleiß und Eifer, der sich hier betätigt!

J. T. W.

 Book Review. — Literatur.

Gospel Light. Comments on the Teachings of Jesus from Aramaic and Unchanged Eastern Customs. By *George M. Lamsa, B. A.*, ethnologist, Aramaic language expert. The A. J. Holman Company, Bible publishers, Philadelphia, Pa. 401 pages, $5\frac{1}{4} \times 7\frac{3}{4}$. Price, \$2.75.

George M. Lamsa is an Assyrian Christian, who was born in the mountains of Kurdistan, about forty miles south of the Lesser Mount Ararat, but is now a citizen of the United States. The present volume is his fifth work, its predecessors being *The Four Gospels from Aramaic; My Neighbor Jesus; The Key to the Origin of the Gospels; and The Secret of the East*. Lamsa claims that Jesus spoke Northern Aramaic which is his own mother tongue; that the four gospels were originally written in Aramaic for Aramaic-speaking peoples (which of course is not true); and that the Greek translators (he denies the doctrine of divine inspiration, at least in *praxi*) were woefully ignorant of the true meaning of the Aramaic idioms, which they took over in literal version into their Greek texts. The result is that Bible students to-day do not properly understand many passages in the gospels. In view of this fact Lamsa regards it as his proper task to set Western Bible scholars right by interpreting to them the true signification of the Aramaic idioms in obscure gospel-passages. His works fairly bristle with linguistic, historical, and theological errors, a fact which was abundantly proved by recognized scholars already in their reviews of his previous books. Nevertheless his manuscript has so impressed Dr. J. P. Harrington of the Smithsonian Institute at Washington, D. C. (ethnologist of acknowledged worth), that he wrote the Foreword to the present volume, and the A. J. Holman Company that it saw fit to publish this latest of his literary products. Manifestly quite a number of Bible students in our country have taken Lamsa seriously, so that also this new book of his may receive their approval. To the reviewer it seems as if Lamsa wrote the greater part of his new opus with his tongue in his cheek, depending on the gullibility of American readers to accept the preposterous interpretations (which have absolutely no trace of a chance to stand before the forum of scholarly research) which he sets forth in his new pot-boiler. Let us clearly and vigorously state that Lamsa's new book has but little value in clearing up Bible-passages and that his "comments" in many cases are self-evident, in numerous others, however, linguistically impossible, hermeneutically improbable, and doctrinally unsound and heretical. For illustration and proof we quote a few Lamsaisms. Thus Christ's beatitude "Blessed are the poor in spirit," Matt. 5, 3, Aramaically and Lamsaically interpreted, means: "Blessed are those who have no racial prejudice and are tolerant." Or: "Whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her," etc., Matt. 5, 28, means: "Who looks not at her face, but upon her naked form as she bathes in her garden, as did David when he espied Bathsheba." Or: "Deliver us from evil" means: "Part us from error." Or: "As Jonas was in the whale's belly," Matt. 12, 39 ff., means: "Jonas was in a hole, to use an American slang expression, *i. e.*, he was in great trouble, just as Christ was in great trouble when He was captured

and maltreated by His enemies." Or: "Joseph, the husband of Mary, had many wives, and that explains the 'brethren' and 'sisters' in Matt. 13, 55. 56. Or: "When thou hast opened his mouth, thou shalt find a piece of money," Matt. 17, 27, means: "You will catch a fish that is worth one shekel. To the tax-collector Peter either gave the fish itself or the shekel which he got for it." Or: "My God, My God, why hast Thou forsaken Me?" Matt. 27, 46, means: "My God, My God, for this I was kept." Or: "Baptism by water is an outward expression of inward cleanliness, symbolical of the baptism by the Spirit" (Matt. 28, 19). Or: "He cast out many devils," Mark 1, 34, means: "He healed many crazy people." Or: "My name is legion, for we are many," Mark 5, 9, means: "My name is Legion, for I have many wrong ideas and am hopelessly insane." Or: "Jesus did not heed the prayer of the Syrophenician woman because He knew the prejudice of His followers and knew that they would be scandalized if He treated her with the same consideration as His own people" (Mark 7, 26). Or: "This is My body," Mark 14, 22 ff., means: "I shall be slain as this lamb." "This is My blood of the new testament" means: "Drink the wine in memory of My death and resurrection." Or: "Elizabeth, the wife of Zacharias, had daughters, but no son, and she was barren merely because of her advanced age" (Luke 1, 7). Or: "Mary called Magdalene, out of whom went seven devils" (Luke 8, 2), means: "Out of whom went seven evil thoughts that dominated her." Or: "Jesus called Simon Peter for the reason that he could not quickly understand" (John 1, 42). Or: "At the wedding at Cana Jesus did not change water into wine, but served the guests *pure water*, the best of drinks. Afterwards He entertained them with spiritual wine. His words 'Mine hour is not yet come' mean: 'It is not My turn to provide the company with drinks'" (John 2, 1 ff.). In the Orient, according to Lamsa, the host provides the food, but not the drink; for this the guests must supply. Lamsa certainly denies the divine inspiration of the Bible, for he writes: "The writer of the gospel recorded this incident some fifteen or twenty years after Jesus' death. His statement is based solely on the remark made by the chief guest." Or: "Destroy this temple" (John 2, 19) means: "I will destroy these false beliefs and build a new temple not made with hands." Or: "When Jesus spoke to Nicodemus of the necessity of his being born again, Nicodemus did not understand Him because Jesus spoke Galilean Aramaic, while Nicodemus himself spoke Chaldean Aramaic." But enough of this sheer nonsense. The utterly preposterous misinterpretations in this book require no refutation.

J. T. MUELLER.

The Epistle Selections of the Ancient Church. An exegetical-homiletical treatment by *R. C. H. Lenski*. A series of Epistle-texts for the entire church-year. Lutheran Book Concern, Columbus, O. 932 pages, 6×9. Price, \$4.50. Order from Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

Again the untiring pen of Dr. Lenski has given us a work which may be called a *magnum opus*, not only on account of its size, but because of its rich content. As the title indicates, one here finds exegetical discussions of the old Epistle-lessons of the Church, written from the point of view of

the preacher, and at the conclusion of the remarks pertaining to a lesson there are submitted suggestive, helpful outlines, some long, others very brief. What Nebe did in German Dr. Lenski here does in English, with this difference, that his comments strike me as more practical, though not so abounding in exegetical lore as those of the German theologian. The reader will see that our Missouri Synod homiletical literature has been drawn on a number of times, with due acknowledgment. Sixty-four texts are treated, the number exceeding that of the number of weeks in a year because of the inclusion of texts for those major festivals of the church-year which, as a rule, do not fall on a Sunday and of a text for a mission-festival. It has been impossible for me to read all of the 932 pages of this book. What I have perused has impressed me as being sound in doctrine and excellent material to be employed by a minister in preparing for his chief function, that of preaching the Word of God to his congregation. The exposition of the text is based on the Greek original and is thorough and satisfying, touching the points on which there is controversy or which require elucidation.

Concluding his introduction, the venerable author says, speaking of outlines: "When I see another man's outline for a sermon, I am stimulated to try to produce a better one. The present-day fault of the preaching in our Lutheran circles is what Lowell condemned, namely, 'not failure, but low aim.' Let us do our part to raise our pulpit ideals." It is a sentiment which we gladly pass on to our readers. Dr. Lenski does not agree with those who think that preaching on the Epistle-lessons is more difficult than preaching on the Gospel-lessons. It must be admitted, of course, that the latter are far more in favor than the former. Moreover, one feels instinctively that the lack of the story element in the Epistle-texts makes it more difficult to write an interesting sermon on them than on the Gospel-texts. But the mere fact that certain texts present greater difficulties than others should not bar them from the Lutheran pulpit, whose occupant is bound to declare to his flock the whole counsel of God.

Dr. Lenski is entitled to the gratitude of the Lutheran clergy for this work.

NOTE. — The above review was written a few hours before the news of the death of Dr. Lenski was received. Since the author's significance to the Lutheran Church was discussed in the last issue of this journal, the above review was left unaltered.

W. ARNDT.

Present Theological Tendencies. By Edwin Ewart Aubrey. Harper and Brothers, New York. 245 pages, 5½×7¾, including an index of persons and of subjects. Price, \$2.00.

This interesting and informative volume, written by Dr. Aubrey, formerly instructor in religion at Vassar College, at present professor of theology in the divinity school of the University of Chicago, has been selected by the *Religious Book Club* as one of the preeminent theological books of the season "because of its clear-cut and highly informing picture of the dominating tendencies in current theological thinking, including the influences arising out of European thought, too little understood in this country." This characterization of the book is excellent; for in it Dr. Aubrey keenly and, in the main, correctly analyzes the chief present-

day theological trends, current both in Europe and in our own country. The author, himself a pronounced liberal and in complete agreement with the latitudinarian theological tendencies of our age, has instituted his investigations primarily from the viewpoint of the modern-culture problem in its two most important phases: "Why is it that our present Western culture has failed?" and: "What contribution can the Christian religion, viewed as a philosophy of civilization, offer our tottering culture?" The book contains no replies to these weighty queries, but in its final chapter, entitled "Conclusion," the results of the various investigations are placed before the reader with the implied suggestion that he himself, on the basis of the material proffered, find an adequate solution for the problems confronting the Church to-day. While the Biblical theologian, who views all matters in the light of the illuminating Gospel and there finds the true solutions for all problems, religious and otherwise, must reject all the antichristian trends discussed in this volume, the book nevertheless is of value also to him just because of the highly important information on the modern theological tendencies which it so liberally supplies. Modernism, in its various phases, Dialecticism, or Barthianism (we still like that name), Social Gospelism, Neoscholasticism or Neo-Thomism, Theistic Naturalism, Rationalistic Supernaturalism, Scientific Mysticism, etc., all these theological trends are carefully and thoroughly scrutinized and criticized by the writer in his able analyses. Nor can the orthodox theologian ignore contributions of this sort. No matter how much he may dislike the theologies of Barth or Kierkegaard or the social-gospel doctrine of Reinhold Niebuhr or the misplaced optimism of the anthropocentric theology of modern humanism, he must know at least the basic principles of these destructive movements, which all alike repudiate the God and Gospel of the Bible. Dr. Aubrey's judgments may not always be correct, but on the whole his analyses of the present-day theological trends outside the realm of orthodox, Biblical theology are very practical and valuable. To all pastors who wish to be informed on this vital subject we recommend this very reasonably priced volume for careful study. J. T. MUELLER.

Oriental Philosophy. The Story of the Teachers of the East. By *Francis Grant*, Vice-President of the Roerich Museum, New York. The Dial Press, New York. 303 pages, $6\frac{1}{4} \times 9\frac{1}{2}$. Price, \$2.75.

Die Christus-Botschaft und die Religionen. Von *D. Dr. Johannes Witte*, ord. Professor fuer Allgemeine Religionsgeschichte und Missionswissenschaft an der Universitaet Berlin. Goettingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. 280 Seiten, $6\frac{1}{2} \times 9\frac{1}{2}$. Preis: Geheftet 10 RM., Leinwand 12 RM.

Although these two books are written in different languages, they belong together, namely under the category of comparative religion. The first is a sympathetic, frequently really delightful discussion of the chief teachers of false religions, those of India, China, Japan, Iran, and Islam. It really contains much information in a very appealing form and will probably be read with appreciation from this angle. But unfortunately the thesis of the author is fundamentally unsound, for he states, p. VIII: "And finally, reader and friend, must we not all express our appreciation

to the Ineffable One, by whatever name He has manifested Himself through all time?" And again, p. XI: "The prayer behind them is one, that men may yet reach that brotherhood, for which all teachers of East and West have willingly consecrated their lives." And again: "As with Mohammed, so with all flaming seekers of East and West, heroes who came and those who are to be. Each in turn kindles a light by which man may read the pages of an eternal book; a light by which man may find his way in the night-crossing, as he journeys out towards the morning star." All of which is hardly in accordance with one immutable fact, namely, that Christianity is the one absolute religion. — For that reason the second book presents a real antidote, for Dr. Witte, of the Chair of History of Religions and of Missions of the University of Berlin, in an altogether objective and scientific way analyzes the various religions, after some introductory chapters presenting the problem and the solution as given by the Church Fathers, by Luther, and others, including Confucianism, Mohammedanism, Hinduism, Buddhism, and the *Deutsche Glaubensbewegung*, and then very definitely presents his conclusions, which may be summarized in his words: "*Nach der Pruefung der Weltreligionen koennen wir also unser am Anfang unserer Untersuchung aufgestelltes Urteil ganz und gar aufrecht erhalten: Alle Religionen der Menschen sind Irrtum und Irrweg, darum Verderben. Nur in Christus ist Gott und darum nur in der Christus-Botschaft die Rettung der Welt. Hier aber ist auch wirklich die volle Rettung der Welt fuer Zeit und Ewigkeit*" (p. 246). The book abounds in splendid statements, such as the following: "*Nun kam Gott selbst und starb in Christus am Kreuz den Verbrechertod als Suehne fuer die Schuld der Menschen der ganzen Welt. Erst auf Grund dieses Suehnetodes Gottes selbst am Kreuz ist die Vergebung moeglich. Es gibt keine Vergebung am Kreuze Christi vorbei. Das ist das zentrale Heil nach dem Neuen Testament, vorbereitet im Alten Testament, geschaffen durch Christi Tod*" (p. 149). It is a pity that the book is marred by the author's strange rejection of the doctrine of inspiration and his total misunderstanding of Luther's attitude toward the Bible. (P. 63.) In his discussion of the description of heaven as given in the Bible the author has the sentence: "*Alles andere, was die Bibel sonst noch ueber das Jenseits sagt, ist menschliche Phantasie und mit Irrtum untermischt.*" Fortunately such passages are few and far between. The book itself will be hailed with rejoicing by students in the field of comparative religion who desire objective arguments against the syncretists of our day.

P. E. KRETZMANN.

Christ for the Nation. Dr. Walter A. Maier. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo. 272 pages, 5¼×7¾. Price, \$1.50.

In this volume our Concordia Publishing House presents the third series of Dr. Maier's radio sermons, delivered over a chain hook-up and heard and appreciated by many thousands of listeners, as has been evidenced by the heavy radio mail, including voluntary contributions of many thousands of dollars. Dr. Maier dedicated this volume to the memory of his father.

In the first radio address of the series Dr. Maier struck the key-note of his broadcasts by taking as his text 1 Cor. 2, 2: "I determined not to

know anything among you save Jesus Christ, and Him crucified." Dr. Maier said: "As we inaugurate to-day the third season of this radio mission over a special network from Minnesota to the Atlantic seaboard, you may ask in challenge, 'What is the message of this broadcast?' With many and conflicting voices on the air, some that appeal to reason and intellect, some that would inflame passions and prejudices, we promise that these weekly broadcasts have no political aims. This microphone will not be employed to fan the fires of class hatred, bigotry, and intolerance. The facilities of our Gospel network have not been drafted to flood the American nation and our Canadian neighbors with economic theories, financial strategies, and social speculations. Rather do we acknowledge as our own the apostle's determination '*not to know anything . . . save Jesus Christ, and Him crucified.*' Addressing you from the campus of a divinity school that for almost a century has dedicated its resources to the Christ of the Scriptures, I offer you in the name of the Triune God not the Christ of present-day compromise and concession, not the Christ of twentieth-century indifference and indecision, not the Christ of modern doubt and denial, who has been exalted in His humanity only to be robbed of His deity, but (above all the evasion and distortion, the rank unbelief of our day) the Christ of the Cross. With my hand on the Bible, I dedicate this radio mission to the preaching of that Cross,—not as a memorial to martyrdom, a glorified symbol of an unselfish ideal, but as 'the accursed tree,' the cruel, heart-breaking gibbet on which the Savior died the blackest death of all history. That crucified Christ, Son of God, yet Son of Man, offering the eternal mercies of forgiven sins as the free gift of His boundless grace; strengthening our faltering souls with His never-failing Spirit; guiding those who trust in Him from the sorrows of this life to the glories of the next; the Savior for every sin and for every sinner, the unfailing Friend for every moment and for every path; the Christ for our hearts, our homes, our churches, our nation,—this all-sufficient Savior, and Him alone, we offer with the pledge '*Nothing . . . save Jesus Christ, and Him crucified*' in every message, every prayer, every hymn, broadcast over this Gospel network." In his second address Dr. Maier spoke of the Bible and among other things said: "I challenge any one within the range of my voice to show that the Bible, as originally inspired by God, contains even a minute mistake. I ask any opponent of the Scriptures who may have tuned in accidentally or out of curiosity to submit proof that the Bible as given by God makes a single faulty or incorrect statement in any one of its 31,000 plus verses from Genesis to Revelation." The themes of the other addresses were such as "What can the Church Offer in the Present Crisis?" "Build the Home with God"; "God Answers Prayer"; "Unashamed of the Testimony of Christ"; "Back to Bible Truth!" "Strengthen the Foundation"; "Glorying in the Cross"; "The Pleading Love of Christ"; "With Christ at Calvary"; "With Christ at the Open Grave."

We know that both pastors and laymen will derive much spiritual benefit by a careful reading of Dr. Maier's *Christ for the Nation*. May the book have a wide sale not only among the members of our churches, but also among many who do not hear the Gospel from their pulpits and among the many unchurched!

J. H. C. FRITZ.

Glaubensfragen und Bußfragen mit Gebeten. Von Hermann Bezzele. D. Gubert-Verlag, Stuttgart. 96 Seiten $4\frac{1}{4} \times 6$. Preis: Kartoniert, RM. 1; in Leinen, RM. 1.40.

Die hier gebotenen Andachten, aus dem Nachlaß Bezzeles, enthalten I. Betrachtungen über den 1. Johannisbrief, II. Betrachtungen über die Bedeutung der Sakramente. Sie stammen aus den Jahren seiner Wirksamkeit als Rektor der Diakonissenanstalt in Neuendettelsau und wurden dort vor den Diakonissen gehalten. Es sind schlichte, lehrhafte Darlegungen, die ein Pastor sehr gut bewerten kann, wenn auch hin und wieder gewisse Redewendungen etwas fremd anmuten. Eine ähnliche Anwendung des Wortes Gottes bei Beichtanmeldungen und sonstiger pastoraler Arbeit, etwa an Krankenbetten, dürfte sich als sehr segensreich erweisen. Die Gebete tragen das Gepräge rechter Innigkeit und tiefer Gebantenführung.

B. E. K r e t z m a n n.

Topics for the Young People's Society, No. 3. Compiled by Helen Percy. The Warner Press, Anderson, Ind. 128 pages, $4\frac{1}{2} \times 7\frac{1}{4}$. Price, paper, 50 cts.

This little volume might prove very stimulating and interesting in showing what other people are doing for their young people's associations, for the compiler offers 31 topics, or outlines, for topical discussions on various subjects, such as "Do I Want to Be a Christian?" "The Principles of Jesus"; "Have You Fulfilled God's Purpose in You?" In the doctrinal subjects there is much of admiration and imitation of Jesus, but not enough appreciation and appropriation. The entire book might be much improved if the topics were offered in some sort of orderly progression, for it is doubtful whether such sporadic discussions will have lasting value. Many outlines and presentations are hazy, not well organized, and therefore not adequate for the most successful work. There are too many yes — no questions. Mistakes of this kind may be rectified in a new edition of the booklet. Meanwhile topic leaders might examine the compilation for the sake of receiving some idea of what others are doing.

P. E. KRETZMANN.

Faces toward God. By N. M. Ylvisaker. Augsburg Publishing House, Minneapolis, Minn. 240 pages, $5\frac{1}{4} \times 8$. Price, \$1.00. Order from Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

The author of this book is Executive Secretary of the Young People's Luther League of the Norwegian Lutheran Church. He here offers sixteen chapters or meditations, with an Epilog, on some of the fundamental facts which ought to engage the attention of young — and old Christians. In this stimulating, challenging volume practically every chapter contains rich food for thought, although the chapters on "The Cross," "Facing Christ," and "The Praying Heart" seem particularly gripping, since they breathe a burning zeal for a Christ-centered faith and a sanctified life. The book is in a way a companion volume to *The Road Back to God* issued by the executive secretary of the Walther League. It would be most desirable if literature of this type should replace the shallow and poisonous books which are circulating so widely in our days.

P. E. KRETZMANN.

One-Way Streets. Talks to the Teen Age — and Other Ages. By *Arthur Osborne*. The Judson Press, Philadelphia. 213 pages, 5×8. Price, \$1.00.

The author is a layman, a practising civil engineer in Charleston, W. Va., prominent in Sunday-school work in his denomination. The talks which he here offers were delivered before Sunday-school classes and are of the kind frequently given in institutions of this type. Many of the topics and little stories are interesting and valuable, but the application frequently leaves much to be desired, especially in the field of doctrine. The author has no conception of the grace of God in Christ Jesus (p. 29), his statement being: "The grace of Jesus Christ is obtained by simply giving our hearts to Him and resolving to study and follow His teachings." The author considers the hymn "There Is a Fountain Filled with Blood" as "now somewhat out of date," and he has many other misleading ideas. But a careful choice of some of the topics may enable a pastor to inject new life into his own short addresses to children and young people.

P. E. KRETZMANN.

Martin Luther. A Brief Review of His Life and Work. A Children's Reformation Service. By *Peter C. Krey*. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo. Price: Single copy, 5 cts.; dozen, 50 cts., and postage; 100, \$3.50, and postage.

This is a short and simple, but altogether satisfactory service for the children's celebration on Reformation Day, with a full catechization, interspersed with hymns, all of which are taken from the compositions of the great Reformer himself.

P. E. KRETZMANN.

Literatur.

Das soeben erschienene Doppelheft des „Luthertum“ (August-September 1936) — es ist dem Erlanger Kunsthistoriker Hans Preuß zu seinem sechzigsten Geburtstag gewidmet — enthält eine Reihe von Beiträgen, die in enger Beziehung zu dem Arbeitsgebiet des Jubilars stehen. Paul Althaus spricht über den „Sinn der Eucharistie“, Otto Probst bringt eine Untersuchung, „Das Todesjahr Pauli“. Auch Werner Gertt, Hermann Sasse und Johannes Bergdolt sind vertreten. — Die „Theologie der Gegenwart“ bringt in der laufenden Nummer besonders Besprechungen von Büchern auf dem Gebiet des Alten Testaments.

NOTICE TO OUR SUBSCRIBERS.

In order to render satisfactory service, we must have our current mailing-list correct. The expense of maintaining this list has been materially increased. Under present regulations we are subject to a "fine" on all parcels mailed to an incorrect address, inasmuch as we must pay 2 cents for every notification sent by the postmaster on a parcel or periodical which is undeliverable because no forwarding address is available or because there has been a change of address. This may seem insignificant, but in view of the fact that we have subscribers getting three or more of our periodicals and considering our large aggregate subscription list, it may readily be seen that it amounts to quite a sum during a year; for the postmaster will address a notification to each individual periodical. Our subscribers can help us by notifying us — one notification (postal card, costing only 1 cent) will take care of the addresses for several publications. We shall be very grateful for your cooperation.

Kindly consult the address label on this paper to ascertain whether your subscription has expired or will soon expire. "Nov 36" on the label means that your subscription has expired. Please pay your agent or the Publisher promptly in order to avoid interruption of service. It takes about two weeks before the address label can show change of address or acknowledgment of remittance.

When paying your subscription, please mention name of publication desired and exact name and address (both old and new, if change of address is requested).

CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE, St. Louis, Mo.